arXiv:1402.1067v1 [math-ph] 5 Feb 2014

# Generalised Quantum Waveguides

Stefan Haag, Jonas Lampart, Stefan Teufel

February 6, 2014

Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, Mathematisches Institut,
Auf der Morgenstelle 10, 72076 Tübingen, Germany.

**Abstract**

We study general quantum waveguides and establish explicit effective Hamiltonians for the Laplacian on these spaces. A conventional quantum waveguide is an $\varepsilon$-tubular neighbourhood of a curve in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and the object of interest is the Dirichlet Laplacian on this tube in the asymptotic limit $\varepsilon \to 0$. We generalise this by considering fibre bundles $M$ over a $d$-dimensional submanifold $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+k}$ with fibres diffeomorphic to $F \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, whose total space is embedded into an $\varepsilon$-neighbourhood of $B$. From this point of view $B$ takes the role of the curve and $F$ that of the disc-shaped cross-section of a conventional quantum waveguide. Our approach allows, among other things, for waveguides whose cross-sections $F$ are deformed along $B$ and also the study of the Laplacian on the boundaries of such waveguides. By applying recent results on the adiabatic limit of Schrödinger operators on fibre bundles we show, in particular, that for small energies the dynamics and the spectrum of the Laplacian on $M$ are reflected by the adiabatic approximation associated to the ground state band of the normal Laplacian. We give explicit formulas for the according effective operator on $L^2(B)$ in various scenarios, thereby improving and extending many of the known results on quantum waveguides and quantum layers in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

# Contents

**1 Introduction** **2**

**2 Generalised Quantum Waveguides** **8**

**3 Adiabatic Perturbation Theory** **11**

**4 Massive Quantum Waveguides** **15**
4.1 The Pullback Metric . . . . . 15
4.2 The Horizontal Laplacian . . . . . 18
4.3 The Bending Potential . . . . . 19
4.4 The Adiabatic Hamiltonian . . . . . 21
4.4.1 The Operator $P_0H_1P_0$ . . . . . 22
4.4.2 The Adiabatic Potential $V_a$ and "Twisted" Waveguides . . . . . 23
4.4.3 Conclusion . . . . . 25

**5 Hollow Quantum Waveguides** **26**
5.1 The Pullback Metric . . . . . 26
5.2 The Adiabatic Hamiltonian . . . . . 31

# 1 Introduction

Quantum waveguides have been studied by physicists, chemists and mathematicians for many years now and the rate at which new contributions appear is still high (see [BMT07, dOV11, DE95, KS12, KR13, SS13] and references therein). Mathematically speaking, a conventional quantum waveguide corresponds to the study of the Dirichlet Laplacian on a thin tube around a smooth curve in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Of particular interest are effects of the geometry of the tube on the spectrum of and the unitary group generated by the Laplacian. Similarly so-called quantum layers, i.e. the Laplacian on a thin layer around a smooth surface, have been studied [CEK04, KL12, KRT13]. The related problem of the constraining of a quantum particle to a neighbourhood of such a curve (or surface) by a steep potential rather than through the boundary condition was studied in [daC82, deO13, FH01, JK71, Mar95, Mit01, WT13]. Recently, progress has also been made on quantum waveguides and layers in magnetic fields [deO13, KR13, KRT13].

There are obvious geometric generalisations of these concepts. One can consider the Dirichlet Laplacian on small neighbourhoods of $d$-dimensional submanifolds of $\mathbb{R}^{d+k}$ (see e.g. [LL06]), or of any $(d+k)$-dimensional Riemannian manifold. Another possibility is to look at the Laplacian on the boundary of such a submanifold, which, in the case of a conventional waveguide, is a cylindrical surface around a curve in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Beyond generalising to higher dimension and codimension, one could also ask for waveguides with cross-sections that change their shape and size along the curve, or more generally along the submanifold around which the waveguide is modelled.

In the majority of mathematical works on quantum waveguides, with the exception

of [dOV11], such variations of the cross-section along the curve must be excluded. The reason is that, physically speaking, localizing a quantum particle to a thin domain leads to large kinetic energies in the constrained directions, i.e. in the directions normal to the curve for a conventional waveguide, and that variations of the cross-section lead to exchange of this kinetic energy between normal and tangent directions. However, the common approaches require that the Laplacian acts only on functions that have much smaller derivatives in the tangent directions than in the normal directions.

In this paper we show how to cope with several of the possible generalisations mentioned above: (i) We consider general dimension and codimension of the submanifold along which the waveguide is modelled. (ii) We allow for general variations of the cross-sections along the submanifold and thus necessarily for kinetic energies of the same order in all directions, with possible exchange of energy between the tangent and normal directions. (iii) We also include the case of "hollow" waveguides, i.e. the Laplacian on the boundary of a general "massive" quantum waveguide.

All of this is achieved by developing a suitable geometric framework for general quantum waveguides and by the subsequent application of recent results on the adiabatic limit of Schrödinger operators on fibre bundles [LT14]. As concrete applications we will mostly emphasise geometric effects and explain, in particular, how the known effects of "bending" and "twisting" of waveguides in $\mathbb{R}^3$ manifest themselves in higher dimensional generalised waveguides.

Before going into a more detailed discussion of our results and of the vast literature, let us review the main concepts in the context of conventional quantum waveguides in a geometrical language that is already adapted to our subsequent generalisation. Moreover, it will allow us to explain the adiabatic structure of the problem within a simple example.

Consider a smooth curve $c : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^3$ parametrised by arclength with bounded second derivative $c''$ and its $\varepsilon$-neighbourhood

$$\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \ \mathrm{dist}(y, B) \leq \varepsilon \right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$. By $B := c(\mathbb{R})$ we denote the image of the curve in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and we call $\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon$ the tube of a conventional waveguide. The aim is to understand the Laplace operator $\Delta_{\delta^3}$ on $L^2(\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon, \mathrm{d}\delta^3)$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions on $\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon$ in the asymptotic limit $\varepsilon \ll 1$. As different metrics will appear in the course of the discussion, we make the Euclidean metric $\delta^3$ explicit in the Laplacian.

For $\varepsilon$ small enough one can map $\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon$ diffeomorphically onto the $\varepsilon$-tube in the normal bundle of $B$. In order to make the following compuations explicit, we pick an orthonormal frame along the curve. A natural choice is to start with an orthonormal basis $(\tau, e_1, e_2)$ at one point in $B$ such that $\tau = c'$ is tangent and $(e_1, e_2)$ are normal to the curve. Then one obtains a (in this special case global) unique frame by parallel transport of $(\tau, e_1, e_2)$ along the curve $B$. This construction is sometimes called the relatively parallel adapted frame [Bis75]. The frame $(\tau(x), e_1(x), e_2(x))$ satisfies the differential equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tau' \\ e_1' \\ e_2' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \kappa^1 & \kappa^2 \\ -\kappa^1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\kappa^2 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ e_1 \\ e_2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{1}$$

with the components of the mean curvature vector $\kappa^\alpha : B \to \mathbb{R}$ ($\alpha = 1, 2$) given by

$$\kappa^\alpha(x) := \langle \tau'(x), e_\alpha(x) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} = \langle c''(x), e_\alpha(x) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \ .$$

The two normal vector fields $e_{1,2} : B \to \mathbb{R}^3$ form an orthonormal frame of $B$'s normal bundle $\mathsf{N}B$. Hence, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, there is a canonical identification of the $\varepsilon$-tube in the normal bundle denoted by

$$M^\varepsilon := \big\{ \big(x, n^1 e_1(x) + n^2 e_2(x)\big) \in \mathsf{N}B : \ (n_1)^2 + (n_2)^2 \leq \varepsilon^2 \big\} \subset \mathsf{N}B$$

with the original $\varepsilon$-tube $\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ via the map

$$\Phi : M^\varepsilon \to \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon \,, \quad \Phi : \big(x, n^1 e_1(x) + n^2 e_2(x)\big) \mapsto x + n^1 e_1(x) + n^2 e_2(x) \,. \tag{2}$$

We will refer to $F^\varepsilon_x := M^\varepsilon \cap \mathsf{N}_x B$ as the cross-section of $M^\varepsilon$ and to $\Phi(F^\varepsilon_x)$ as the cross-section of $\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon$ at $x \in B$.

In order to give somewhat more substance to the simple example, let us generalise the concept of a conventional waveguide already at this point. For a smooth function $f : B \to [f_-, f_+]$ with $0 < f_- < f_+ < \infty$ let

$$M^\varepsilon_f := \big\{ \big(x, n^1 e_1(x) + n^2 e_2(x)\big) \in \mathsf{N}B : \ (n_1)^2 + (n_2)^2 \leq \varepsilon^2 \, f(x)^2 \big\}$$

be the tube with varying cross-section $F^\varepsilon_x$, a disc of radius $\varepsilon f(x)$. This gives rise to a corresponding tube $\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_f := \Phi(M^\varepsilon_f)$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. To not overburden notation, we will drop the subscript $f$ in the following, i.e. put $M^\varepsilon := M^\varepsilon_f$ and $\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon := \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_f$.

By equipping $M^\varepsilon$ with the pullback metric $g := \Phi^* \delta^3$, we can turn $\Phi$ into an isometry. Then the Dirichlet Laplacian $\Delta_{\delta^3}$ on $L^2(\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon, \mathrm{d}\delta^3)$ is unitarily equivalent to the Dirichlet Laplacian $\Delta_g$ on $L^2(M^\varepsilon, \mathrm{d}g)$.

In order to obtain an explicit expression for $\Delta_g$ with respect to the bundle coordinates $(x, n^1, n^2)$ associated with the orthonormal frame $(e_1(x), e_2(x))$, we need to compute the pullback metric $g$ on the tube $M^\varepsilon$. For the coordinate vector fields $\partial_x$ and $\partial_{n^\alpha}$, $\alpha \in \{1, 2\}$, one finds

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_* \partial_x|_{(x,n)} &= \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} \Phi\Big( \big(c(x), n^\alpha e_\alpha\big(c(x)\big)\big) \Big) = \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} \Big( c(x) + n^\alpha e_\alpha\big(c(x)\big) \Big) \\
&= \tau(x) - n^\alpha \kappa^\alpha(x) \tau(x) = \big(1 - n \cdot \kappa(x)\big) \tau(x) \,, \\
\Phi_* \partial_{n^\alpha}|_{(x,n)} &= \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}n^\alpha} \Phi\Big( \big(c(x), n^\alpha e_\alpha\big(c(x)\big)\big) \Big) = \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}n^\alpha} \Big( c(x) + n^\alpha e_\alpha\big(c(x)\big) \Big) \\
&= e_\alpha(x) \,.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we used $c'(x) = \tau(x)$ and the differential equations (1). Knowing that $(\tau, e_1, e_2)$ is an orthonormal frame of $\mathsf{T}\mathbb{R}^3|_B$ with respect to $\delta^3$, this yields

$$g(x, n) := \begin{pmatrix} (1 - n \cdot \kappa(x))^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} .$$

The Laplace-Beltrami operator on $M^\varepsilon$ associated to $g$ is thus

$$-\Delta_g = -\frac{1}{(1-n\cdot\kappa)^2}\left(\partial_x^2 + \frac{n\cdot\kappa'}{1-n\cdot\kappa}\,\partial_x\right) - \Delta_n + \frac{\kappa\cdot\nabla_n}{1-n\cdot\kappa}$$

with $\Delta_n = \nabla_n^2 = \partial_{n^1}^2 + \partial_{n^2}^2$. As the Riemannian volume measure of $g$ on coordinate space reads $\mathrm{d}g = (1-n\cdot\kappa(x))\mathrm{d}\delta^3$, it is convenient to introduce the multiplication operator $\mathcal{M}_\rho : \psi \mapsto \rho^{1/2}\psi$ with the density $\rho(x,n) := 1 - n\cdot\kappa(x)$ as a unitary operator from $L^2(M^\varepsilon, \mathrm{d}g)$ to $L^2(M^\varepsilon, \mathrm{d}\delta^3)$. Here $\mathrm{d}\delta^3$ just denotes Lebesgue measure on the coordinate space. A straightforward computation shows that

$$\mathcal{M}_\rho\big(-\Delta_g\big)\mathcal{M}_\rho^* = -\Delta_{\mathrm{hor}} - \Delta_n + V_\rho \tag{3}$$

with

$$\Delta_{\mathrm{hor}} := \partial_x\,\rho^{-2}\,\partial_x = \partial_x^2 + \partial_x(\rho^{-2}-1)\partial_x$$

and

$$V_\rho := -\frac{\kappa^2}{4\rho^2} - \frac{n\cdot\kappa''}{2\rho^3} - \frac{5(n\cdot\kappa')^2}{4\rho^4}\,.$$

The rescaling by $\rho$ thus leads to a simpler split up of the Laplacian $-\Delta_g$ into a horizontal operator $\Delta_{\mathrm{hor}}$ and a vertical operator $\Delta_n$ given by the Euclidean Laplace operator with Dirichlet boundary conditions on the cross-sections $F_x^\varepsilon$. This simplification is, however, at the expense of an additional potential $V_\rho$.

Since $F_x^\varepsilon$ is isometric to the disc of radius $\varepsilon f(x)$, the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the vertical operator $\Delta_n$ are $\varepsilon$-dependent and also functions of $x \in B$. In order to arrive at an $\varepsilon$-independent vertical operator and an $\varepsilon$-independent domain, one dilates the fibres of $\mathsf{N}B$ using $\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon : (x,n) \mapsto (x,\varepsilon n)$ and its associated lift to a unitary operator mapping $L^2(M^{\varepsilon=1}, \mathrm{d}\delta^3)$ to $L^2(M^\varepsilon, \mathrm{d}\delta^3)$. One then arrives at

$$\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^*\mathcal{M}_\rho\big(-\Delta_g\big)\mathcal{M}_\rho^*\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon = -(\partial_x^2 + \varepsilon S^\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^{-2}\Delta_n + V_{\mathrm{bend}}$$

with the second order differential operator

$$S^\varepsilon := \varepsilon^{-1}\partial_x\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^*(\rho^{-2}-1)\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon\partial_x = \varepsilon^{-1}\partial_x\,\underbrace{(\rho_\varepsilon^{-2}-1)}_{=2\varepsilon n\cdot\kappa+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)}\,\partial_x\,, \quad \rho_\varepsilon := 1-\varepsilon n\cdot\kappa$$

and the bending potential

$$V_{\mathrm{bend}} := \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^* V_\rho \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon = -\frac{\kappa^2}{4\rho_\varepsilon^2} - \frac{\varepsilon n\cdot\kappa''}{2\rho_\varepsilon^3} - \frac{5(\varepsilon n\cdot\kappa')^2}{4\rho_\varepsilon^4} = -\frac{\kappa^2}{4} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)\,. \tag{4}$$

These terms account for the bending of the curve in the ambient space, i.e. its extrinsic geometry.

In order to make the asymptotic limit $\varepsilon \to 0$ more transparent, we rescale units of energy in such a way that the transverse energies are of order one by multiplying the

full Laplacian with $\varepsilon^2$. In summary one finds that $-\varepsilon^2\Delta_g$ is unitarily equivalent to the operator

$$H^\varepsilon := \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^* \mathcal{M}_\rho \big(-\varepsilon^2 \Delta_g\big) \mathcal{M}_\rho^* \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon = -\varepsilon^2 \Delta_{\mathsf{H}} - \Delta_{\mathsf{V}} + \varepsilon^2 V_{\text{bend}} - \varepsilon^3 S^\varepsilon$$

acting on the domain $D(H^\varepsilon) = W^2(M) \cap W_0^1(M) \subset L^2(M)$ with $M := M^{\varepsilon=1}$. The Hamiltonian $H^\varepsilon$ thus splits into the horizontal Laplacian $\varepsilon^2\Delta_{\mathsf{H}} := \varepsilon^2\partial_x^2$, the vertical Laplacian $\Delta_{\mathsf{V}} := \Delta_n$ and a additional differential operator $\varepsilon H_1 := \varepsilon^2 V_{\text{bend}} - \varepsilon^3 S^\varepsilon$ that will be treated as a perturbation. This structure is reminiscent of the starting point for the Born-Oppenheimer approximation in molecular physics. There the $x$-coordinate(s) describe heavy nuclei and $\varepsilon^2$ equals the inverse mass of the nuclei. The $n$-coordinates describe the electrons with mass of order one. In both cases the vertical resp. electron operator depends on $x$: the vertical Laplacian $\Delta_{\mathsf{V}}$ in the quantum waveguide Hamiltonian $H^\varepsilon$ depends on $x \in B$ through the domain $F_x := F_x^{\varepsilon=1}$ and the electron operator in the molecular Hamiltonian depends on $x$ through an interaction potential. This suggests to study the asymptotics $\varepsilon \ll 1$ for quantum waveguide Hamiltonians by the same methods that have been successfully developed for molecular Hamiltonians, namely by adiabatic perturbation theory. The latter allows to seperate slow and fast degrees of freedom in a systematic way. In the context of quantum waveguides the tangent dynamics are slow compared to the frequencies of the normal modes.

To illustrate the adiabatic structure of the problem, let $\lambda_0(x) \sim \frac{1}{f(x)^2}$ be the smallest eigenvalue of $-\Delta_{\mathsf{V}}$ on $F_x$ and denote by $\phi_0(x) \in L^2(F_x)$ the corresponding normalised non-negative eigenfunction, the so-called ground state wave function. Let

$$P_0 L^2(M) := \big\{ \Psi(x,n) = \psi(x)\phi_0(x,n) : \ \psi \in L^2(B) \big\} \subset L^2(M)$$

be the subspace of local product states and $P_0$ the orthogonal projection onto this space. Now the restriction of $H^\varepsilon$ to the subspace $P_0 L^2(M)$ is called the adiabatic approximation of $H^\varepsilon$ on the ground state band and the associated adiabatic operator is defined by

$$H_{\text{a}} := P_0 H^\varepsilon P_0 \,. \tag{5}$$

A simple computation using

$$(P_0\Psi)(x,n) = \langle \phi_0(x,\cdot), \Psi(x,\cdot)\rangle_{L^2(F_x)} \ \phi_0(x,n)$$

and the unitary identification $W : P_0 L^2(M) \to L^2(B)$, $\psi(x)\phi_0(x,n^1,n^2) \mapsto \psi(x)$, shows that the adiabatic operator $H_{\text{a}}$ can be seen as an operator acting only on functions on the curve $B$, given by

$$\begin{aligned}(W H_{\text{a}} W^* \psi)(x) = \big(-\varepsilon^2\partial_x^2 + \lambda_0(x) + \varepsilon^2 V_{\text{a}}(x) + \varepsilon^2 V_{\text{bend}}^0(x)\big)\psi(x) \\ + \varepsilon^3 \int_{F_x} \phi_0(x,n)\big(S^\varepsilon(\phi_0\psi)\big)(x,n) \ \mathrm{d}n + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3)\,,\end{aligned}$$

where $V_{\text{a}}(x) := \|\partial_x \phi_0(x)\|^2_{L^2(F_x)}$ and $V_{\text{bend}}^0(x) = -\frac{\kappa^2(x)}{4}$. As such it is a one-dimensional Schrödinger-type operator with potential function $\lambda_0(x) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$ and the asymptotic

limit $\varepsilon \ll 1$ corresponds to the semi-classical limit. This analogy shows that, in general, $-\varepsilon^2\partial_x^2$ cannot be considered small compared to $\lambda_0(x)$, despite the factor of $\varepsilon^2$. To see this, observe that all eigenfunctions $\psi^\varepsilon$ (and also all solutions of the corresponding time-dependent Schrödinger equation) are necessarily $\varepsilon$-dependent with $\|\varepsilon\partial_x\psi^\varepsilon\|^2 \gg \varepsilon^2$, unless $\lambda_0(x) \equiv c$ for some constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$. To be more explicit, assume that $\lambda_0(x) \approx \omega^2(x-x_0)^2$ near a global minimum at $x_0$. Then the lowest eigenvalues of $H_\mathrm{a}$ are $e_\ell = \lambda_0(x_0)+\varepsilon\omega(1+2\ell) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$ for $\ell = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. While the level spacing of order $\varepsilon$ is small compared to $\lambda_0$, it is large compared to the energy scale of order $\varepsilon^2$ of the geometric potentials. And for states $\psi^\varepsilon$ with $\ell \sim \varepsilon^{-1}$ the kinetic energy $\|\varepsilon\partial_x\psi^\varepsilon\|^2$ in the tangential direction is of order one.

However, the majority of mathematical works on the subject considers the situation where $\|\varepsilon\partial_x\psi^\varepsilon\|^2$ is of order $\varepsilon^2$. Clearly this only yields meaningful results if one assumes $\lambda_0 \equiv c$ for some constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$. But this, in turn, puts strong constraints on the possible geometries of the waveguide, which we avoid in the present paper.

Now the obvious mathematical question is: *To what extent and in which sense do the properties of the adiabatic operator $H_\mathrm{a}$ reflect the corresponding properties of $H^\varepsilon$?* This question was answered in great generality in [Lam13, LT14] and we will translate these results to our setting of generalised quantum waveguides in Section 3. Roughly speaking, Theorem 3.3 states that the low-lying eigenvalues of $H_\mathrm{a}$ approximate those of $H^\varepsilon$ up to errors of order $\varepsilon^3$ in general, and up to order $\varepsilon^4$ in the special case of $\lambda_0 \equiv c$. In the latter case the order $\varepsilon^3$ terms in $H_\mathrm{a}$ turn out to be significant as well.

Our main new contribution in this work is to introduce the concept of generalised quantum waveguides in Section 2 and to compute explicitly the adiabatic operator for such generalised waveguides to all significant orders. For massive quantum waveguides, which are basically "tubes" with varying cross-sections modelled over submanifolds of arbitrary dimension and codimension, this is done in Section 4. There we follow basically the same strategy as in the simple example given in the present section. We obtain general expressions for the adiabatic operator, from which we determine the relevant terms for different energy scales. Though the underlying calculations of geometric quantities have been long known [Tol88], the contribution of $S^\varepsilon$ has usually been neglected, because at the energy scale of $\varepsilon^2$ it is of lower order than $V_\mathrm{bend}$. This changes however on the natural energy scale of the example $M_f$ with non-constant $f$, where they may be of the same order, as we see in Section 4.4.3. The contribution of the bending potential is known to be non-positive in dimensions $d = 1$ or $d = 2$ [CEK04, Kre07], while it has no definite sign in higher dimensions [Tol88]. It was stressed in [Kre07] that this leads to competing effects of bending and the non-negative "twisting potential" in quantum waveguides whose cross-sections $F_x$ are all isometric but not rotationally invariant and twist along the curve relative to the parallel frame. The generalisation of this twisting potential is the adiabatic potential $V_\mathrm{a}$, which is always non-negative and of the same order as $V_\mathrm{bend}$. Using this general framework we generalise the concept of "twisted" waveguides to arbitrary dimension and codimension in Section 4.4.2.

In Section 5 we finally consider hollow waveguides, which are the boundaries of massive waveguides. So far there seem to be no results on these waveguides in the literature and the adiabatic operator derived in Section 5.2 is completely new. For hollow wave-

guides the vertical operator is essentially the Laplacian on a compact manifold without boundary and thus its lowest eigenvalue vanishes identically, $\lambda_0(x) \equiv 0$. The adiabatic operator on $L^2(B)$ is quite different from the massive case. Up to errors of order $\varepsilon^3$, it is the sum of the Laplacian on $B$ and an effective potential given in (45). For the special case of the boundary of $M_f^\varepsilon$ discussed above this potential is given by

$$\varepsilon^2 \left[ \tfrac{1}{2}\partial_x^2 \log\big(2\pi f(x)\big) + \tfrac{1}{4}\big|\partial_x \log\big(2\pi f(x)\big)\big|^2 \right] = \varepsilon^2 \left[ \tfrac{1}{2}\tfrac{f''}{f} - \tfrac{1}{4}\big(\tfrac{f'}{f}\big)^2 \right] ,$$

which, in contrast to massive waveguides, is independent of the curvature $\kappa$ and depends only on the rate of change of $\mathrm{Vol}(\partial F_x) = 2\pi f(x)$. One can check for explicit examples that a local constriction in the tube, e.g. for $f(x) = 2 - \frac{1}{1+x^2}$, leads to an effective potential with wells. Thus, constrictions can support bound states on the surface of a tube.

# 2 Generalised Quantum Waveguides

In this part we give a precise definition of what we call generalised quantum waveguides. In view of the example discussed in the introduction, the ambient space $\mathbb{R}^3$ is replaced by $(d+k)$-dimensional Euclidean space and the role of the curve is played by an arbitrary smooth $d$-dimensional submanifold $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+k}$. The generalised waveguide $M$ is contained in a neighbourhood of the zero section in $\mathsf{N}B$ which can be diffeomorphically mapped to a tubular neighbourhood of $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+k}$. We will again call $F_x = M \cap \mathsf{N}_x B$ the cross-section of the quantum waveguide at the point $x \in B$ and essentially assume that $F_x$ and $F_y$ are diffeomorphic for $x, y \in B$. This allows for general deformations of the cross-sections as one moves along the base, where in the introduction we only considered scaling by the function $f$.

In order to separate the Laplacian into its horizontal and vertical parts, we follow the strategy of the previous section. However, it will be more convenient to adopt the equivalent viewpoint, where we implement the scaling within the metric $g^\varepsilon$ on $M = M^{\varepsilon=1} \subset \mathsf{N}B$ instead of shrinking $M^\varepsilon \subset \mathsf{N}B$ and keeping $g$ fixed.

For the following considerations, we assume that there exists a tubular neighbourhood $B \subset \mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+k}$ with globally fixed diameter, i.e. there is $r > 0$ such that normals to $B$ of length less than $r$ do not intersect. More precisely, we assume that the map

$$\Phi : \mathsf{N}B \to \mathbb{R}^{d+k} , \quad (x, \nu) \mapsto x + \nu ,$$

restricted to

$$\mathsf{N}B^r := \big\{ (x,\nu) \in \mathsf{N}B : \ \|\nu\|_{\mathbb{R}^{d+k}} < r \big\} \subset \mathsf{N}B$$

is a diffeomorphism to its image $\mathcal{T}$. Again, this mapping $\Phi$ provides a metric $G := \Phi^* \delta^{d+k}$ on $\mathsf{N}B^r$ and the rescaled version $G^\varepsilon := \varepsilon^{-2} \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^* G$, where $\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon : (x,\nu) \mapsto (x, \varepsilon\nu)$ is the dilatation of the fibres in $\mathsf{N}B$.

**Definition 2.1** Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+k}$ be a smooth $d$-dimensional submanifold with tubular neighbourhood $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+k}$ and $F$ be a compact manifold with smooth boundary and $\dim F \leq k$.

Suppose $M \subset \mathsf{N}B^r = \Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{T})$ is a connected subset that is a fibre bundle with projection $\pi_M : M \to B$ and typical fibre $F$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \hookrightarrow & \mathsf{N}B \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_M}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_{\mathsf{N}B}} \\ B & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{id}_B]{} & B \end{array}$$

commutes. We then call the pair $(M, g^\varepsilon)$, with the scaled pullback metric

$$g^\varepsilon := G^\varepsilon|_{\mathsf{T}M} \in \mathcal{T}_2^0(M)\,,$$

a *generalised quantum waveguide*.

It immediately follows from the commutative diagram that the cross-sections $F_x$ coincide with the fibres $\pi_M^{-1}(x)$ given by the fibre bundle structure. From now on we will usually refer to this object simply as the fibre of $M$ over $x$. Although other geometries are conceivable, the most interesting examples of generalised waveguides are given by subsets $M \subset \mathsf{N}B^r$ of codimension zero and their boundaries. In the following we will only treat these two cases and distinguish them by the following terminology:

**Definition 2.2** Let $F \to M \xrightarrow{\pi_M} B$ be a generalised quantum waveguide as in Definition 2.1.

1. We call $M$ *massive* if $F$ is the closure of an open, bounded and connected subset of $\mathbb{R}^k$ with smooth boundary.

2. We call $M$ *hollow* if $\dim(F) > 0$ and there exists a massive quantum waveguide $\mathring{F} \to \mathring{M} \xrightarrow{\pi_{\mathring{M}}} B$ such that $M = \partial\mathring{M}$.

This definition implies $\pi_M = \pi_{\mathring{M}}|_M$, i.e. each fibre $F_x = \pi_M^{-1}(x)$ of a hollow quantum waveguide is the boundary of $\mathring{F}_x$, the fibre of the related massive waveguide $\mathring{M}$.

We denote by $\mathsf{V}M := \ker(\pi_{M*}) \subset \mathsf{T}M$ the vertical subbundle of $\mathsf{T}M$. Its elements are vectors that are tangent to the fibres of $M$. We refer to the orthogonal complement of $\mathsf{V}M$ (with respect to $g := g^{\varepsilon=1}$) as the horizontal subbundle $\mathsf{H}M \cong \pi_M^*(\mathsf{T}B)$. Clearly

$$\mathsf{T}M = \mathsf{H}M \oplus \mathsf{V}M\,, \tag{6}$$

and this decomposition will turn out to be independent of $\varepsilon$. That is, the decomposition $\mathsf{T}M = \mathsf{H}M \oplus \mathsf{V}M$ is orthogonal for every $\varepsilon > 0$. Furthermore, we will see (Lemma 4.1 and equation (19) for the massive case, equation (40) for hollow waveguides) that the scaled pullback metric is always of the form

$$g^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-2}(\pi_M^* g_B + \varepsilon h^\varepsilon) + g_F\,, \tag{7}$$

where

- $g_B := \delta^{d+k}|_{\mathsf{T}B} \in \mathcal{T}^0_2(B)$ is the induced Riemannian metric on the submanifold $B$,
- $h^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{T}^0_2(M)$ is a symmetric (but not necessarily non-degenerate) tensor with $h^\varepsilon(V,\cdot) = 0$ for any vertical vector field $V$,
- $g_F := g^\varepsilon|_{\mathsf{V}M}$ is the $\varepsilon$-independent restriction of the scaled pullback metric to its vertical contribution.

Thus, if we define for any vector field $X \in \Gamma(\mathsf{T}B)$ its unique horizontal lift $X^{\mathsf{H}M} \in \Gamma(\mathsf{H}M)$ by the relation $\pi_{M*}X^{\mathsf{H}M} = X$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g^\varepsilon(X^{\mathsf{H}M}, Y^{\mathsf{H}M}) &= \varepsilon^{-2}\big(g_B(X,Y) + \varepsilon h^\varepsilon(X^{\mathsf{H}M}, X^{\mathsf{H}M})\big)\,, \\ g^\varepsilon(X^{\mathsf{H}M}, V) &= 0\,, \\ g^\varepsilon(V,W) &= g_F(V,W) \end{aligned}$$

for all $X, Y \in \Gamma(\mathsf{T}B)$ and $V, W \in \Gamma(\mathsf{V}M)$.

**Example 2.3** In the introduction we considered a massive waveguide $M = M_f$ with $d = 1$ and $k = 2$. The typical fibre was given by $F = \mathbb{D}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Using the bundle coordinates $(x, n^1, n^2)$ induced by (2), one easily checks the the scaled pullback metric reads

$$g^\varepsilon := \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon^{-2}(1-\varepsilon n\cdot\kappa)^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

hence

$$g_B = \mathrm{d}x^2\,, \quad g_F = \mathrm{d}(n^1)^2 + \mathrm{d}(n^2)^2\,, \quad h^\varepsilon = \big(-2(n\cdot\kappa) + \varepsilon(n\cdot\kappa)^2\big)\,\mathrm{d}x^2\,.$$

Finally remark that $\mathbb{S}^1 = \partial\mathbb{D}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is the typical fibre of the associated hollow waveguide.

After having introduced the geometry of a generalised waveguide $(M, g^\varepsilon)$, we now analyse the Laplace-Beltrami operator $\Delta_{g^\varepsilon}$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions. The boundary condition is of course vacuous if $M$ is hollow since $\partial M = \emptyset$ in that case. Similarly to the introduction (3), we apply a unitary $\mathcal{M}_{\rho_\varepsilon}$ (which equals $\mathcal{D}^*_\varepsilon \mathcal{M}_\rho \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon$ in the earlier notation). The according scaled density is given by

$$\rho_\varepsilon := \frac{\mathrm{d}g^\varepsilon}{\mathrm{d}g^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{s}}}\,, \quad g^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{s}} := \varepsilon^{-2}\pi_M^* g_B + g_F\,. \tag{8}$$

We call the metric $g^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{s}}$ the (scaled) submersion metric on $M$, since it turns $\pi_M$ into a Riemannian submersion. The transformed Laplacian then reads

$$H^\varepsilon = \mathcal{M}_{\rho_\varepsilon}\big(-\Delta_{g^\varepsilon}\big)\mathcal{M}^*_{\rho_\varepsilon} = -\varepsilon^2\Delta_{\mathsf{H}} - \Delta_{\mathsf{V}} + \varepsilon^2 V_{\mathrm{bend}} - \varepsilon^3 S^\varepsilon\,.$$

Here, the horizontal Laplacian is defined by its quadratic form (with $g_{\mathrm{s}} := g_{\mathrm{s}}^{\varepsilon=1}$)

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \Psi, -\Delta_{\mathsf{H}} \Psi \rangle &= \int_M \pi_M^* g_B\big(\operatorname{grad}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}} \overline{\Psi}, \operatorname{grad}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}} \Psi\big)\, \mathrm{d}g_{\mathrm{s}} \\ &= \int_M g_{\mathrm{s}}\big(\operatorname{grad}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}} \overline{\Psi}, \mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{H}M} \operatorname{grad}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}} \Psi\big)\, \mathrm{d}g_{\mathrm{s}}\,,\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{H}M}$ denotes the orthogonal projection to $\mathsf{H}M$, so integration by parts yields (see also Section 4.2)

$$\Delta_{\mathsf{H}} = \operatorname{div}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}} \mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{H}M} \operatorname{grad}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}}\,. \tag{9}$$

The vertical operator is given on each fibre $F_x$ by the Laplace-Beltrami operator

$$\Delta_{\mathsf{V}}|_{F_x} := \Delta_{g_{F_x}}$$

with Dirichlet boundary conditions. The bending potential

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon^2 V_{\mathrm{bend}} &= \tfrac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}^{\varepsilon}} \operatorname{grad}_{g^{\varepsilon}}(\log \rho_\varepsilon) + \tfrac{1}{4} g^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon, \mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}(\varepsilon^2 \Delta_{\mathsf{H}} + \Delta_{\mathsf{V}})(\log\rho_\varepsilon) + \tfrac{1}{4} g_F(\mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon, \mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^4)\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

is a by-product of the unitary transformation $M_{\rho_\varepsilon}$ and the second order differential operator

$$S^{\varepsilon} : \Psi \mapsto S^{\varepsilon}\Psi := \varepsilon^{-3} \operatorname{div}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}}(g^{\varepsilon} - g_{\mathrm{s}}^{\varepsilon})(\mathrm{d}\Psi, \cdot)$$

accounts for the corrections to $g_s^{\varepsilon}$.

# 3 Adiabatic Perturbation Theory

In this section we show that the adiabatic operator $H_{\mathrm{a}}$ approximates essential features of generalised quantum waveguide Hamiltonians $H^{\varepsilon}$, such as its unitary group and its spectrum. This motivates the derivation of explicit expansions of $H_{\mathrm{a}}$ in the subsequent sections. In this work we will only consider the ground state band $\lambda_0(x)$ and pay special attention to the behaviour of $H^{\varepsilon}$ for small energies. This, as we will show, allows to view $H_{\mathrm{a}}$ as an operator on $L^2(B)$. The results of this section were derived in [Lam13, LT14] in more generality.

For a massive quantum waveguide set

$$H_F := -\Delta_{\mathsf{V}} \tag{massive}$$

and for a hollow waveguide

$$H_F := -\Delta_{\mathsf{V}} + \tfrac{1}{2}\Delta_{\mathsf{V}}(\log\rho_\varepsilon) + \tfrac{1}{4} g_F(\mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon, \mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon)\,. \tag{hollow}$$

Let $\lambda_0(x) := \min \sigma(H_{F_x})$ be the smallest eigenvalue of the fibre operator $H_F$ acting on the fibre over $x$. For hollow waveguides we have no boundary and $\lambda_0 \equiv 0$ with the eigenfunction

$$\phi_0 = \sqrt{\rho_\varepsilon}\Big(\int_{F_x} \rho_\varepsilon \, \mathrm{d}g_F\Big)^{-1/2} = \pi_M^* \mathrm{Vol}(F_x)^{-1/2} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)\,.$$

In the massive case we have $\lambda_0 > 0$ and denote by $\phi_0(x,\cdot)$ the uniquely determined positive normalised eigenfunction of $H_{F_x}$ with eigenvalue $\lambda_0(x)$. Let $P_0$ be the orthogonal projection in $L^2(M)$ defined by

$$(P_0\Psi)(x,\nu) = \phi_0\big(x,\nu\big) \int_{F_x} \phi_0\big(x,\cdot\big)\Psi(x,\cdot) \, \mathrm{d}g_F\,.$$

The image of this projection is the subspace $L^2(B) \otimes \mathrm{span}(\phi_0) \cong L^2(B)$ of $L^2(M)$. The function $\phi_0$ and its derivatives, both horizontal and vertical, are uniformly bounded in $\varepsilon$. Thus, the action of the horizontal Laplacian $-\varepsilon^2\Delta_{\mathsf{H}}$ on $\phi_0$ gives a term of order $\varepsilon$ and

$$[H^\varepsilon, P_0]P_0 = [H^\varepsilon - H_F, P_0]P_0 = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \tag{11}$$

as an operator from $D(H^\varepsilon)$ to $L^2(M)$. Since this expression equals $(H^\varepsilon - H_\mathrm{a})P_0$, this justifies the adiabatic approximation (5) for states in the image of $P_0$. However, the error is of order $\varepsilon$, while interesting effects of the geometry, such as the potentials $V_\mathrm{a}$ and $V_\mathrm{bend}$ discussed in the introduction, are of order $\varepsilon^2$. Because of this it is desirable to construct also a super-adiabatic approximation, consisting of a modified projection $P_\varepsilon = P_0 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(M)) \cap \mathcal{L}(D(H^\varepsilon))$ and an intertwining unitary $U_\varepsilon$ with $P_\varepsilon U_\varepsilon = U_\varepsilon P_0$, such that the effective operator

$$H_\mathrm{eff} := P_0 U_\varepsilon^* H^\varepsilon U_\varepsilon P_0$$

provides a better approximation of $H^\varepsilon$ than $H_\mathrm{a}$ does. It then turns out that the approximation provided by $H_\mathrm{a}$ can also be made more accurate than expected from (11) using the unitary $U_\varepsilon$.

Such approximations can be constructed and justified if the geometry of $(M, g^\varepsilon)$ satisfies some uniformity conditions. Here we only spell out the conditions relevant to our case, for a comprehensive discussion see [Lam13].

**Definition 3.1** The generalised quantum waveguide $(M, g^\varepsilon)$ is a *waveguide of bounded geometry* if the following conditions are satisfied:

1. The manifold $(B, g_B)$ is of bounded geometry. This means it has positive injectivity radius and for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant $C_k > 0$ such that

   $$g_B(\nabla^k R, \nabla^k R) \leq C_k\,,$$

   where $R$ denotes the curvature tensor of $B$ and $\nabla$, $g_B$ are the connections and metrics induced on the tensor bundles over $B$.

2. The fibre bundle $(M,g) \xrightarrow{\pi_M} (B,g_B)$ is uniformly locally trivial. That is, there exists a Riemannian metric $g_0$ on $F$ such that for every $x \in B$ and metric ball $B(r,x)$ of radius $r < r_{\mathrm{inj}}(B)$ there is a trivialisation $\Omega_{x,r} : (\pi_M^{-1}(B(x,r)), g) \to (B(x,r) \times F, g_B \times g_0)$, and the tensors $\Omega_{x,r}^*$ and $\Omega_{x,r*}$ and all their covariant derivatives are bounded uniformly in $x$.

3. The embeddings $(M,g) \hookrightarrow (\mathsf{N}B, G)$ and $(B,g_B) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d+k}$ are bounded with all their derivatives.

These conditions are trivially satisfied for compact manifolds $M$ and many examples such as "asymptotically straight" or periodic waveguides. The existence result for the super-adiabatic approximation can be formulated as follows.

**Theorem 3.2 ([LT14])** *Let $M$ be a waveguide of bounded geometry and set $\Lambda := \inf_{x\in B} \min(\sigma(H_{F_x}) \setminus \lambda_0)$. For every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist a projection $P_\varepsilon$ and a unitary $U_\varepsilon$ in $\mathcal{L}(L^2(M)) \cap \mathcal{L}(D(H^\varepsilon))$, intertwining $P_0$ and $P_\varepsilon$, such that for every $\chi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty\big((-\infty,\Lambda),[0,1]\big)$, satisfying $\chi^p \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty\big((-\infty,\Lambda),[0,1]\big)$ for every $p \in (0,\infty)$, we have*

$$\|H^\varepsilon \chi(H^\varepsilon) - U_\varepsilon H_{\mathrm{eff}} \chi(H_{\mathrm{eff}}) U_\varepsilon^*\| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^N)\,.$$

*In particular the Hausdorff distance between the spectra of $H^\varepsilon$ and $H_{\mathrm{eff}}$ is small, i.e. for every $\delta > 0$ :*

$$\mathrm{dist}\left(\sigma(H^\varepsilon) \cap (-\infty, \Lambda - \delta], \sigma(H_{\mathrm{eff}}) \cap (-\infty, \Lambda - \delta]\right) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^N)\,.$$

For $N = 1$ we can choose $P_\varepsilon = P_0$, so at first sight the approximation of $H^\varepsilon$ by $H_{\mathrm{a}}$ yields errors of order $\varepsilon$. More careful inspection shows that for $N > 1$ we have $H_{\mathrm{a}} - H_{\mathrm{eff}} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$ as an operator from $W^2(B)$ to $L^2(M)$, so the statement on the spectrum holds for $H_{\mathrm{a}}$ with an error of order $\varepsilon^2$. This improvement over (11) relies on the existence of $U_\varepsilon$ for a better choice of trial states. Close to the ground state the approximation is even more accurate.

**Theorem 3.3 ([LT14])** *Let $M$ be a waveguide of bounded geometry, $\Lambda_0 := \inf_{x\in B} \lambda_0(x)$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 2$. Then for every $C > 0$*

$$\mathrm{dist}\left(\sigma(H^\varepsilon) \cap (-\infty, \Lambda_0 + C\varepsilon^\alpha], \sigma(H_{\mathrm{a}}) \cap (-\infty, \Lambda_0 + C\varepsilon^\alpha]\right) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{2+\alpha/2})\,.$$

*Assume, in addition, that $\Lambda_0 + C\varepsilon^\alpha$ is strictly below the essential spectrum of $H_{\mathrm{a}}$ in the sense that for some $\delta > 0$ and $\varepsilon$ small enough the spectral projection $\mathbf{1}_{(-\infty,\Lambda_0+(C+\delta)\varepsilon^\alpha]}(H_{\mathrm{a}})$ has finite rank. Then, if $\mu_0 < \mu_1 \leq \ldots \leq \mu_K$ are all the eigenvalues of $H_{\mathrm{a}}$ below $\Lambda_0 + C\varepsilon^\alpha$, $H^\varepsilon$ has at least $K+1$ eigenvalues $\nu_0 < \nu_1 \leq \ldots \leq \nu_K$ below its essential spectrum and*

$$|\mu_j - \nu_j| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{2+\alpha})$$

*for $j \in \{0,\ldots,K\}$.*

The natural energy scale $\alpha$ to consider this theorem would be the spacing of eigenvalues of $H_{\mathrm{a}}$. This of course depends on the specific situation. If $\lambda_0$ is constant we will see that $\alpha = 2$ is a natural choice. In the somewhat more generic case in which the eigenband $\lambda_0(x)$ has a global and non-degenerate minimum, as in the example of the waveguide $M_f$ in the introduction, the lowest eigenvalues of $H_{\mathrm{a}}$ will behave like those of an harmonic oscillator and $\alpha = 1$ is the correct choice of scale. In this case the set $(-\infty, \Lambda_0 + C\varepsilon^2] \cap \sigma(H_{\mathrm{a}})$ will just be empty for $\varepsilon$ small enough and thus by the theorem there is no spectrum of $H^\varepsilon$ in this interval.

We remark that results can be obtained also for energies higher than $\Lambda$ and projections to other eigenbands than $\lambda_0$. The relevant condition is that they are separated from the rest of the spectrum of $H_F$ by a local gap. For $\lambda_0$ this is a consequence of the bounded geometry of $M$ (see [LT14, Proposition 4.1]). The approximation of spectra is not mutual as for low energies, but there is always spectrum of $H^\varepsilon$ near that of $H_{\mathrm{eff}}$ (see [LT14, Corollary 2.4]).

From now on we will focus on analysing the adiabatic operator. In particular we will see how the geometry of the waveguide enters into this operator and its expansion up to order $\varepsilon^4$, which is relevant for small energies irrespective of the super-adiabatic corrections by Theorem 3.3. We now give a general expression for $H_{\mathrm{a}}$ from which we will derive the explicit form for various specific situations. First group the terms of $H^\varepsilon$ in such a way that

$$H^\varepsilon = -\varepsilon^2 \Delta_{\mathsf{H}} + H_F + \varepsilon H_1 \,,$$

by taking

$$\begin{aligned}
H_1 &= -\varepsilon^2 S^\varepsilon + \varepsilon V_{\mathrm{bend}} \,, && \text{(massive)} \\
H_1 &= -\varepsilon^2 S^\varepsilon + \varepsilon V_{\mathrm{bend}} - \varepsilon^{-1}\big(\tfrac{1}{2}\Delta_{\mathsf{V}}(\log \rho_\varepsilon) + \tfrac{1}{4} g_F(\mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon, \mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon)\big) && \text{(hollow)} \\
&= -\varepsilon^2 S^\varepsilon + \underbrace{\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}\Delta_{\mathsf{H}}(\log\rho_\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3)}_{=:\varepsilon \tilde{V}_{\mathrm{bend}}} \,.
\end{aligned}$$

Projecting this expression with $P_0$ as in equation (5) gives $H_F P_0 = \lambda_0 P_0$ and

$$P_0 \Delta_{\mathsf{H}} P_0 = \Delta_{g_B} + \underbrace{\tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}_{g_B}(\nabla^B \bar{\eta}) - \int_{F_x} \pi_M^* g_B(\mathrm{grad}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}}\phi_0, \mathrm{grad}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}}\phi_0)\, \mathrm{d}g_F}_{=:-V_{\mathrm{a}}} \,, \tag{12}$$

where $\nabla^B$ is the Levi-Cività connection of $g_B$, $\bar{\eta}$ is the one-form

$$\bar{\eta}(X) := \int_{F_x} |\phi_0|^2 g_B(\pi_{M*}\eta_F, X)\, \mathrm{d}g_F$$

and $\eta_F$ is the mean curvature vector of the fibres (see equation (21)). The derivation for the projection of $\Delta_{\mathsf{H}}$ can be found in [Lam13, Chapter 3].

Altogether we have the expression

$$H_{\mathrm{a}} = -\varepsilon^2 \Delta_{g_B} + \lambda_0 + \varepsilon^2 V_{\mathrm{a}} + \varepsilon P_0 H_1 P_0 \tag{13}$$

for the adiabatic operator as an operator on $L^2(B)$. By analogy with the introduction, we view

$$(P_0 S^\varepsilon P_0)\psi = \int_{F_x} \phi_0 S^\varepsilon(\phi_0\psi)\, \mathrm{d}g_F$$

as an operator on $B$ via the identification $L^2(B) \cong L^2(B) \otimes \mathrm{span}(\phi_0)$. By the same procedure, projecting the potentials in $H_1$ amounts to averaging them over the fibres with the weight $|\phi_0|^2$.

# 4 Massive Quantum Waveguides

The vast literature on quantum waveguides is, in our terminology, concerned with the case of massive waveguides. In this section we give a detailed derivation of the effects due to the extrinsic geometry of $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+k}$. The necessary calculations of the metric $g^\varepsilon$ and the bending potential $V_{\mathrm{bend}}$ have been performed in all of the works on quantum waveguides for the respective special cases, and by Tolar [Tol88] for the leading order $V^0_{\mathrm{bend}}$ in the general case. A generalisation to tubes in Riemannian manifolds is due to Wittich [Wit07].

We then discuss the explicit form of the adiabatic Hamiltonian (5), calculating the adiabatic potential and the projection of $H_1$. In particular we generalise the concept of a "twisted" waveguide (c.f. [Kre07]) to arbitrary dimension and codimension in Section 4.4.2. We also examine the role of the differential operator $S^\varepsilon$ in $H_{\mathrm{a}}$, which is rarely discussed in the literature, and its relevance for the different energy scales $\varepsilon^\alpha$.

## 4.1 The Pullback Metric

Let $(x^1, \ldots, x^d)$ be local coordinates on $B$ and $\{e_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^k$ a local orthonormal frame of $M$ with respect to $g_B^\perp := \delta^{d+k}|_{\mathsf{N}B}$ such that every normal vector $\nu(x) \in \mathsf{N}_x B$ may be written as

$$\nu(x) = n^\alpha e_\alpha(x)\,. \tag{14}$$

These bundle coordinates yield local coordinate vector fields

$$\partial_i|_{(x,n)} := \tfrac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\,, \quad \partial_{d+\alpha}|_{(x,n)} := \tfrac{\partial}{\partial n^\alpha} \tag{15}$$

on $M$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ and $\alpha \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. The aim is to obtain formulas for the coefficients of the unscaled pullback metric $g = \Phi^* \delta^{d+k}|_{\mathsf{T}M}$ with respect to these coordinate vector fields.

Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open neighbourhood of zero, $b : I \to M$, $s \mapsto b(s) = (c(s), v(s))$ be a curve with $b(0) = (x, n)$ and $b'(0) = \xi \in \mathsf{T}_{(x,n)}M$. It then holds that

$$\Phi_* \xi = \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\big|_{s=0} \Phi\big(b(s)\big) = c'(0) + v'(0)\,.$$

For the case $\xi = \partial_i|_{(x,n)}$, we choose the curve $b : I \to M$ given by

$$b(s) = \Big(c(s), n^\alpha e_\alpha\big(c(s)\big)\Big) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Phi\big(b(s)\big) = c(s) + n^\alpha e_\alpha\big(c(s)\big)$$

where $c : I \to B$ is a smooth curve with $c(0) = x$ and $c'(0) = \partial_{x^i} \in \mathsf{T}_x B$. We then have

$$\Phi_* \partial_i|_{(x,n)} = c'(0) + n^\alpha \, \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\big|_{s=0} e_\alpha\big(c(s)\big) = \partial_{x^i} + n^\alpha \nabla^{\mathbb{R}^{d+k}}_{\partial_{x^i}} e_\alpha(x)$$

In order to relate the appearing derivative $\nabla^{\mathbb{R}^{d+k}}_{\partial_{x^i}} e_\alpha(x)$ to the extrinsic curvature of $B$, we project the latter onto its tangent and normal component, respectively. Therefor, we introduce the Weingarten map

$$\mathcal{W} : \Gamma(\mathsf{N}B) \to \mathcal{T}^1_1(B)\,, \quad e_\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)\partial_{x^i} := -\,\mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{T}B}\, \nabla^{\mathbb{R}^{d+k}}_{\partial_{x^i}} e_\alpha\,,$$

and the $\mathfrak{so}(k)$-valued local connection one-form associated to the normal connection $\nabla^{\mathsf{N}}$ with respect to $\{e_\alpha\}_{k=1}^{\alpha}$, i.e.

$$\omega^{\mathsf{N}}(\partial_{x^i}) e_\alpha = \nabla^{\mathsf{N}}_{\partial_{x^i}} e_\alpha := \mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{N}B}\, \nabla^{\mathbb{R}^{d+k}}_{\partial_{x^i}} e_\alpha\,.$$

With these objects we have

$$\Phi_* \partial_i|_{(x,n)} = \partial_{x^i} + n^\alpha \Big(-\mathcal{W}\big(e_\alpha(x)\big)\partial_{x^i} + \omega^{\mathsf{N}}(\partial_{x^i}) e_\alpha(x)\Big). \tag{16}$$

For the case $\xi = \partial_{d+\alpha}|_{(x,n)}$, one takes the curve $b : I \to M$ with

$$b(s) = \big(x, \nu(x) + s e_\alpha(x)\big) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Phi\big(b(s)\big) = x + (n^\beta + s\delta_\alpha{}^\beta) e_\beta(x)\,.$$

Hence,

$$\Phi_* \partial_{d+\alpha}|_{(x,n)} = 0 + \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\big|_{s=0} (n^\beta + s\delta_\alpha{}^\beta) e_\beta(x) = \delta_\alpha{}^\beta e_\beta(x) = e_\alpha(x)\,. \tag{17}$$

Combining the expressions for the tangent maps, we finally obtain the following expressions for the pullback metric $g$:

**Lemma 4.1** *Let $(x, n)$ denote the local bundle coordinates on $M$ introduced in* (14) *and* (15) *the associated coordinate vector fields. Then the coefficients of the pullback metric are given by*

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{ij}(x,n) &= g_B(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j}) - 2\,\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j}) + g_B\big(\mathcal{W}(\nu)\partial_{x^i}, \mathcal{W}(\nu)\partial_{x^j}\big) \\
&\quad + g_B^\perp\big(\omega^{\mathsf{N}}(\partial_{x^i})\nu, \omega^{\mathsf{N}}(\partial_{x^j})\nu\big)\,, \\
g_{i,d+\alpha}(x,n) &= g_B^\perp\big(\omega^{\mathsf{N}}(\partial_{x^i})\nu, e_\alpha\big)\,, \\
g_{d+\alpha,d+\beta}(x,n) &= g_B^\perp\big(e_\alpha, e_\beta\big) = \delta_{\alpha\beta}
\end{aligned}$$

*for $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Here, $\mathrm{II} : \Gamma(\mathsf{N}B) \to \mathcal{T}^0_2(B)$ stands for the second fundamental form defined by $\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j}) := g_B(\mathcal{W}(\nu)\partial_{x^i}, \partial_{x^j})$.*

Let us now consider the scaled pullback metric $g^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-2}\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^*\Phi^*\delta^{d+k}|_{\mathsf{T}M}$. Observe that for any $\xi \in \mathsf{T}_{(x,n)}M$

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_*(\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon)_*\xi &= (\Phi\circ\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon)_*\xi\\ &= \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\big|_{s=0}(\Phi\circ\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon)\big(b(s)\big) = \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\big|_{s=0}(\Phi\circ\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon)\big(c(s),v(s)\big)\\ &= \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s}\big|_{s=0}\Phi\big(c(s),\varepsilon v(s)\big) = c'(0)+\varepsilon v'(0)\end{aligned}$$

and one immediately concludes from (16) and (17) that

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_*(\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon)_*\partial_i|_{(x,n)} &= \partial_{x^i} + \varepsilon n_\alpha\Big(-\mathcal{W}\big(e_\alpha(x)\big)\partial_{x^i} + \omega^N(\partial_{x^i})e_\alpha(x)\Big),\\ \Phi_*(\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon)_*\partial_\alpha|_{(x,n)} &= \varepsilon e_\alpha(x)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the coefficients of the scaled pullback metric are given by

$$\begin{aligned}g^\varepsilon_{ij}(x,n) &= \varepsilon^{-2}\Big[g_B(\partial_{x^i},\partial_{x^j}) - \varepsilon 2\,\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\partial_{x^i},\partial_{x^j}) + \varepsilon^2 g_B\big(\mathcal{W}(\nu)\partial_{x^i},\mathcal{W}(\nu)\partial_{x^j}\big)\\ &\qquad + \varepsilon^2 g_B^\perp\big(\omega^{\mathsf{N}}(\partial_{x^i})\nu,\omega^{\mathsf{N}}(\partial_{x^j})\nu\big)\Big]\,,\\ g^\varepsilon_{i,d+\alpha}(x,n) &= g_B^\perp\big(\omega^{\mathsf{N}}(\partial_{x^i})\nu,e_\alpha\big)\,,\\ g^\varepsilon_{d+\alpha,d+\beta}(x,n) &= \delta_{\alpha\beta}\end{aligned}$$

for $i,j\in\{1,\dots,d\}$ and $\alpha,\beta\in\{1,\dots,k\}$.

We see that $\operatorname{span}\{\partial_i|_{(x,n)}\}_{i=1}^d$ is not orthogonal to $\operatorname{span}\{\partial_{d+\alpha}|_{(x,n)}\}_{\alpha=1}^k = \mathsf{V}_{(x,n)}M$ with respect to $g^\varepsilon$. However, any vector $\partial_i|_{(x,n)}$ can be orthogonalised by subtracting its vertical component. The resulting vector

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{x^i}^{\mathsf{H}M}|_{(x,n)} &:= \partial_i|_{(x,n)} - g^\varepsilon_{i,d+\beta}(x,n)\,\partial_{d+\beta}|_{(x,n)}\\ &= \partial_i|_{(x,n)} - g_B^\perp\big(\omega^{\mathsf{N}}(\partial_{x^i})\nu,e_\beta\big)\,\partial_{d+\beta}|_{(x,n)}\\ &= \partial_i|_{(x,n)} - g_{i,d+\beta}(x,n)\,\partial_{d+\beta}|_{(x,n)}\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

is the horizontal lift of $\partial_{x^i}$. Consequently, the orthogonal complement of $\mathsf{V}_{(x,n)}M$ with respect to $g^\varepsilon$ is given by $\mathsf{H}_{(x,n)}M = \operatorname{span}\{\partial_{x^i}^{\mathsf{H}M}|_{(x,n)}\}_{i=1}^d$ for all $\varepsilon>0$. Finally, a short computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}&g^\varepsilon(\partial_{x^i}^{\mathsf{H}M}|_{(x,n)},\partial_{x^j}^{\mathsf{H}M}|_{(x,n)})\\ &\quad= \varepsilon^{-2}g_B\Big(\big(1-\varepsilon\mathcal{W}(\nu)\big)\partial_{x^i},\big(1-\varepsilon\mathcal{W}(\nu)\big)\partial_{x^j}\Big)\\ &\quad= \varepsilon^{-2}\Big[g_B(\partial_{x^i},\partial_{x^j}) + \varepsilon\Big(-2\,\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\partial_{x^i},\partial_{x^j}) + \varepsilon g_B\big(\mathcal{W}(\nu)\partial_{x^i},\mathcal{W}(\nu)\partial_{x^j}\big)\Big)\Big]\,.\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

Hence, the scaled pullback metric $g^\varepsilon$ actually has the form (7) with "horizontal correction"

$$h^\varepsilon(\partial_{x^i}^{\mathsf{H}M}|_{(x,n)},\partial_{x^j}^{\mathsf{H}M}|_{(x,n)}) = -2\,\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\partial_{x^i},\partial_{x^j}) + \varepsilon g_B\big(\mathcal{W}(\nu)\partial_{x^i},\mathcal{W}(\nu)\partial_{x^j}\big)\,.\tag{20}$$

**Remark 4.2** The fibres $F_x$ of $M$ are completely geodesic for the pullback metric $g^\varepsilon$. In order to see this, we show that the second fundamental form of the fibres $\mathrm{II}^F|_x : \mathsf{H}_x M \to \mathcal{T}^0_2(F_x)$ vanishes identically. Since the latter is a symmetric tensor, it is sufficient to show that the diagonal elements

$$\mathrm{II}^F(\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i})(\partial_\alpha,\partial_\alpha) = g^\varepsilon(\nabla^M_{\partial_\alpha}\partial_\alpha, \partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i})$$

are zero. Using Koszul's formula, four out of the six appearing terms obviously vanish and we are left with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{II}^F(\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i})(\partial_\alpha,\partial_\alpha) &= g_F\big([\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i},\partial_\alpha],\partial_\alpha\big)\\
&\overset{(18)}{=} g_F\Big(\underbrace{[\partial_i,\partial_\alpha]}_{=0} - \big[g_{i,d+\beta}(x,n)\partial_\beta,\partial_\alpha\big],\partial_\alpha\Big)\\
&= \frac{g_{i,d+\beta}(x,n)}{\partial n^\alpha}\underbrace{g_F(\partial_\beta,\partial_\alpha)}_{\delta_{\beta\alpha}}\\
&= g^\perp_B(\omega^{\mathsf{N}}(\partial_{x^i})e_\alpha, e_\alpha)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

But now, the last expression equals zero since $\omega^{\mathsf{N}}(\partial_{x^i})$ is $\mathfrak{so}(k)$-valued. Consequently, the mean curvature vector $\eta_F$ defined by

$$\mathrm{tr}_{\mathsf{T}F}\,\mathrm{II}(\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i}) = \pi^*_M g_B(\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i},\eta_F) \tag{21}$$

vanishes identically. Finally note that the same considerations also hold for the submersion metric $g^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{s}}$ due to $g^\varepsilon|_{\mathsf{V}M} = g_F = g^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{s}}|_{\mathsf{V}M}$.

## 4.2 The Horizontal Laplacian

Now that we have a detailed description of the metric, we can explicitly express the horizontal Laplacian by the vector fields $(\{\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i}\}_{i=1}^d, \{\partial_{d+\alpha}\}_{\alpha=1}^k)$. Let $(\{\pi^*_M \mathrm{d}x^i\}_{i=1}^d, \{\delta n^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^k)$ be the dual basis (note that in general $\delta n^\alpha \neq \mathrm{d}n^\alpha$ since $\mathrm{d}n^\alpha(\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i}) \neq 0$). Then by definition

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta n^\alpha(\mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{H}M}\,\mathrm{grad}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}}\psi) &= 0\,,\\
\pi^*_M\mathrm{d}x^i(\mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{H}M}\,\mathrm{grad}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}}\psi) &= g^{jk}_{\mathrm{s}}(\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^j}\psi)\mathrm{d}x^i(\partial_{x^k}) = g^{ij}_B\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^j}\psi
\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\mathrm{grad}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}}\psi = g^{ij}_B(\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i}\psi)\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^j}\,.$$

When acting on a horizontal vector field $Y$, the divergence takes the coordinate form

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{div}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}} Y &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g_{\mathrm{s}}|}}\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i}\sqrt{|g_{\mathrm{s}}|}(\pi^*_M\mathrm{d}x^i(Y))\\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g_B|}}\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i}\sqrt{|g_B|}\big(\pi^*_M\mathrm{d}x^i(Y)\big) - \pi^*_M g_B(\eta_F,Y)\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

since $\sqrt{|g_F|}^{-1}\big(\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i}\sqrt{|g_F|}\big) = -g_{\mathrm{s}}(\eta_F, \partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i})$. For a horizontal lift $X^{\mathsf{H}M}$ we have the simple formula

$$\operatorname{div}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}} X^{\mathsf{H}M} = \pi_M^*\big(\operatorname{div}_{g_B} X - g_B(\pi_{M*}\eta_F, X)\big)\,.$$

Now for a massive waveguide $\eta_F = 0$ and the horizontal Laplacian takes the familiar form

$$\Delta_{\mathsf{H}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g_B|}}\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i}\sqrt{|g_B|}g_B^{ij}\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^j}\,,$$

which is just $\Delta_{g_B}$ with $\partial_{x^i}$ replaced by $\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i}$.

## 4.3 The Bending Potential

In the introduction (see equation (4)) we saw that the leading order of $V_{\mathrm{bend}}$ is attractive (negative) and proportional to the square of the curve's curvature $\kappa = |c''|$. Here we give a detailed derivation of $V_{\mathrm{bend}}$ for generalised massive waveguides and then discuss the sign of its leading part. Therefor, let $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be a local orthonormal frame of $\mathsf{T}B$ with respect to $g_B$ and let $\{n^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^k$ be coordinates on $\mathsf{N}B$ as in equation (14). Then

$$T_i := \tau_i^{\mathsf{H}M}\,, \quad N_\alpha := \tfrac{\partial}{\partial n^\alpha}$$

for $i \in \{1,\dots,d\}$ and $\alpha \in \{1,\dots,k\}$ form a local frame of $\mathsf{T}M$. In this frame the scaled metrics have the form (see also (19))

$$g^\varepsilon = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \varepsilon^{-2}(\mathrm{id}_{d\times d} - \varepsilon\mathcal{W}(\nu))^2 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \mathrm{id}_{k\times k}\end{array}\right)\,, \quad g_{\mathrm{s}}^\varepsilon = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \varepsilon^{-2}\,\mathrm{id}_{d\times d} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \mathrm{id}_{k\times k}\end{array}\right)\,.$$

From that and equation (8) we easily conclude that

$$\rho_\varepsilon = \sqrt{\frac{\det(g^\varepsilon)}{\det(g_{\mathrm{s}}^\varepsilon)}} = \det\big(\mathrm{id}_{d\times d} - \varepsilon\mathcal{W}(\nu)\big) = \exp\Big(\operatorname{tr}\log\big(\mathrm{id}_{d\times d} - \varepsilon\mathcal{W}(\nu)\big)\Big).$$

Using Taylor's expansion for $\varepsilon$ small enough,

$$-\log\big(\mathrm{id}_{d\times d} - \varepsilon\mathcal{W}(\nu)\big) = \underbrace{\varepsilon\mathcal{W}(\nu) + \tfrac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\mathcal{W}(\nu)^2 + \tfrac{\varepsilon^3}{3}\mathcal{W}(\nu)^3}_{=:\mathcal{Z}(\varepsilon)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^4)\,,$$

we have $\log(\rho_\varepsilon) = -\operatorname{tr}\mathcal{Z}(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^4)$. Next, we calculate the terms appearing in $V_{\mathrm{bend}}$ (10) separately:

$$\Delta_{\mathsf{H}}\log\rho_\varepsilon = -\varepsilon\Delta_{\mathsf{H}}\operatorname{tr}\mathcal{W}(\nu) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\,,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon^{-2}\Delta_{\mathsf{V}}\log\rho_\varepsilon &= -\varepsilon^{-2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^k \partial_{n^\alpha}^2 \operatorname{tr}\mathcal{Z}(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2) \\ &= -\sum_{\alpha=1}^k\Big[\operatorname{tr}\big(\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)^2\big) + 2\varepsilon\operatorname{tr}\big(\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)^2\mathcal{W}(\nu)\big)\Big] + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\,,\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon &= \mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{H}M}\,\mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon - \mathrm{tr}\big(\partial_{n_\alpha}\mathcal{Z}(\varepsilon)\big)\,\mathrm{d}n^\alpha + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^4)\\ &= \mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{H}M}\,\mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon - \mathrm{tr}\Big(\varepsilon\mathcal{W}(\mathrm{e}_\alpha)\big(\mathrm{id}_{d\times d}+\varepsilon\mathcal{W}(\nu)+\varepsilon^2\mathcal{W}(\nu)^2\big)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}n^\alpha + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^4)\,,\end{aligned}$$

denoting by $\mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{H}M}$ the adjoint of the original $\mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{H}M}$ with respect to the pairing of $\mathsf{T}^*M$ and $\mathsf{T}M$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}&\varepsilon^{-2}g_F(\mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon,\mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon)\\ &=\sum_{\alpha=1}^{k}\Big[\big(\mathrm{tr}\,\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)\big)^2+2\varepsilon\,\mathrm{tr}\big(\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)\big)\,\mathrm{tr}\big(\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)\mathcal{W}(\nu)\big)\Big]+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Putting all this together, we obtain the following expression for the bending potential in the case of massive quantum waveguides:

$$V_{\mathrm{bend}} = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{k}\Big[\big(\mathrm{tr}\,\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)\big)^2-2\,\mathrm{tr}\big(\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)^2\big)\Big] \tag{23}$$

$$+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{k}\Big[\mathrm{tr}\,\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)\,\mathrm{tr}\big(\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)\mathcal{W}(\nu)\big)-2\,\mathrm{tr}\big(\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)^2\mathcal{W}(\nu)\big)-\Delta_{\mathsf{H}}\,\mathrm{tr}\,\mathcal{W}(\nu)\Big] \tag{24}$$

$$+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\,.$$

The leading term of this expression ($V^0_{\mathrm{bend}} := (23)$) has been widely stressed in the literature concerning one-dimensional quantum waveguides (see e.g. [DE95, Kre07]), where it has a purely attractive effect. Its higher dimensional versions were discussed by Tolar [Tol88] but are generally less known, so we will discuss their possible effects for the rest of this section.

Since $\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)$ is self-adjoint, we may choose for each $\alpha\in\{1,\dots,k\}$ the orthonormal frame $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^d$ such that it consists of the eigenvectors of $\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)$ with eigenvalues (principal curvatures) $\{\kappa_i^\alpha\}_{i=1}^d$. In order to get an impression of $V^0_{\mathrm{bend}}$'s sign, we divide $\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)$ into a traceless part $\mathcal{W}_0(e_\alpha)$ and a multiple of the identity:

$$\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)=\mathcal{W}_0(e_\alpha)+\frac{H_\alpha}{d}\,\mathrm{id}_{d\times d}\,.$$

Note that the prefactors $H_\alpha$ equal the components of the mean curvature vector of $B$ in direction $e_\alpha$. With the notation

$$\|M\|^2 := \mathrm{tr}\big(M^{\mathrm{t}}M\big)\geq 0$$

for any $M\in\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$, we get the relation

$$\|\mathcal{W}(e_\alpha)\|^2=\|\mathcal{W}_0(e_\alpha)\|^2+\frac{H_\alpha^2}{d}$$

for all $\alpha \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ since $\mathcal{W}_0(\cdot)$ is traceless. This yields for the potential (23):

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{bend}}^0 &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{k} \left[ H_\alpha^2 - 2 \left\| \mathcal{W}(e_\alpha) \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{k} \left[ H_\alpha^2 - 2 \left( \left\| \mathcal{W}_0(e_\alpha) \right\|^2 + \frac{H_\alpha^2}{d} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{k} \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{2}{d} \right) H_\alpha^2 - 2 \left\| \mathcal{W}_0(e_\alpha) \right\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The latter relation shows that for $d \in \{1, 2\}$ the leading order of the bending potential is non-positive. Thus, the effect of bending has an attractive character ($V_{\text{bend}}^0 < 0$) for $\varepsilon$ small enough, or is of lower order ($V_{\text{bend}}^0 = 0$), independently of the codimension $k$. For $d \geq 3$, the first term is non-negative and may overcompensate the second term leading to a positive contribution to $V_{\text{bend}}$. Consequently, a repulsive bending effect is possible.

**Example 4.3** We may rewrite expression (23) in terms of principal curvatures as

$$V_{\text{bend}}^0 = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{k} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^{d} \kappa_i^\alpha \right)^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{d} (\kappa_i^\alpha)^2 \right]. \tag{25}$$

1. For a waveguide modelled around a curve $c$, $d = 1$, one immediately sees that $V_{\text{bend}}^0 = -\frac{1}{4}\kappa^2 = -\frac{1}{4} \left| c' \right|^2$.

2. We consider the case where $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ is the $d$-dimensional standard sphere of radius $R$. The principal curvatures in the direction of the outer-pointing normal are given by $\kappa_i = 1/R$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$, hence the bending potential (25) reads

$$V_{\text{bend}}^0 = \frac{1}{4} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{R} \right)^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left( \frac{1}{R} \right)^2 \right] = \left( 1 - \frac{2}{d} \right) \frac{d^2}{4R^2}.$$

   It follows that $V_{\text{bend}}^0 < 0$ for $d = 1$, $V_{\text{bend}}^0 = 0$ for $d = 2$ and $V_{\text{bend}}^0 > 0$ for $d \geq 3$, respectively. Thus, depending on the dimension $d$ of the sphere, the effect of bending can be either attractive or repulsive.

## 4.4 The Adiabatic Hamiltonian

We are now ready to calculate the geometric terms in the adiabatic operator. In this we concentrate on the adiabatic operator (13) and explicitly calculate all the relevant terms on the energy scale given by Theorem 3.3. First we take care of the contribution of $H_1$, then we turn to the potential $V_{\text{a}}$ and explain its connection to "twisting" of the quantum waveguide.

### 4.4.1 The Operator $P_0 H_1 P_0$

The contribution of the bending potential, that was calculated in the previous section, is given by its adiabatic approximation

$$V_{\text{bend}}^{\text{a}} := P_0 V_{\text{bend}} P_0 = \int_{F_x} V_{\text{bend}}(\nu)\, |\phi_0(\nu)|^2 \ \mathrm{d}\nu\,.$$

Since the leading part $V_{\text{bend}}^0$ is independent of the fibre coordinate $\nu$, it is unchanged by this projection. The next term in the expansion of $V_{\text{bend}}$ is given by (24). The Weingarten map is linear in $\nu$ and since

$$\partial_{x^i}^{\mathsf{H}M} n^\alpha \overset{(18)}{=} -g_B^\perp\big(\omega^{\mathsf{N}}(\partial_{x^i})\nu, e_\beta\big)\partial_{n^\beta} n^\alpha = -g_B^\perp\big(\omega^{\mathsf{N}}(\partial_{x^i})\nu, e_\alpha\big)$$

is again linear in $\nu$, $\Delta_{\mathsf{H}} \operatorname{tr} \mathcal{W}(\nu)$ is also linear in $\nu$. Consequently, the contribution of (24) to $V_{\text{bend}}^{\text{a}}$ is proportional to

$$\langle \phi_0, \nu\phi_0 \rangle_{F_x} = \int_{F_x} \nu\, |\phi_0(\nu)|^2 \ \mathrm{d}\nu\,.$$

Hence, this contribution vanishes if the centre of mass of the ground state $\phi_0$ lies exactly on the submanifold $B$. This is a reasonable assumption to make and represents a "correct" choice of parametrisation of the waveguide. Under this assumption we have

$$V_{\text{bend}}^{\text{a}} = V_{\text{bend}}^0 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\,.$$

From the expression (19) for the horizontal block of the metric $g^\varepsilon$ one obtains its expansion on horizontal one-forms by locally inverting the matrix $(g^\varepsilon)_{ij}$ (see [Wit07]). The result is

$$g^\varepsilon(\pi_M^* \mathrm{d}x^i, \pi_M^* \mathrm{d}x^j) = \varepsilon^2\big(g_B^{ij} + 2\varepsilon\, \mathrm{II}(\nu)^{ij} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\big)\,, \tag{26}$$

where II denotes the second fundamental form of $B$, defined on $\mathsf{T}^*B$ by $\mathrm{II}^{ij} := \mathrm{II}_{kl}\, g_B^{ik} g_B^{jl}$. Moreover, we extend the latter to $\mathsf{T}^*M$, understanding $\mathrm{II}(\nu)$ as its lift to the horizontal part $\mathsf{H}^*M$ and extending to $\mathsf{T}^*M$ by zero. The vertical components of $g^\varepsilon$ and $g_{\text{s}}^\varepsilon$ coincide, hence as an operator on $L^2(B)$ we have the expression

$$(P_0 S^\varepsilon P_0)\psi = 2\int_{F_x} \phi_0 \operatorname{div}_{g_{\text{s}}}\Big(\mathrm{II}(\nu)\big(\mathrm{d}(\phi_0\psi), \cdot\big)\Big)\ \mathrm{d}\nu + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \tag{27}$$

with an error of order $\varepsilon$ on $W^2(B)$. Using the Leibniz rule we can rewrite this as

$$\begin{aligned} &2\int_{F_x} 2\phi_0\, \mathrm{II}(\nu)\big(\mathrm{d}\phi_0, \mathrm{d}\psi\big) + |\phi_0|^2 \operatorname{div}_{g_{\text{s}}}\big(\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\mathrm{d}\psi, \cdot)\big) + \phi_0\psi \operatorname{div}_{g_{\text{s}}}\big(\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\mathrm{d}\phi_0, \cdot)\big)\ \mathrm{d}\nu \\ &\quad = 2\int_{F_x} \operatorname{div}_{g_{\text{s}}}\big(|\phi_0|^2\, \mathrm{II}(\nu)(\mathrm{d}\psi, \cdot)\big) + \phi_0\psi \operatorname{div}_{g_{\text{s}}}\big(\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\mathrm{d}\phi_0, \cdot)\big)\ \mathrm{d}\nu\,. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Now $\phi_0$ vanishes on the boundary and $\mathrm{II}(\mathrm{d}\psi, \cdot)$ is a horizontal vector field, so by (22) we have

$$\int_{F_x} \mathrm{div}_{g_\mathrm{s}}\big(|\phi_0|^2\, \mathrm{II}(\nu)(\mathrm{d}\psi, \cdot)\big)\ \mathrm{d}\nu = \mathrm{div}_{g_B} \int_{F_x} |\phi_0|^2\, \mathrm{II}(\nu)(\mathrm{d}\psi, \cdot)\ \mathrm{d}\nu\,. \tag{29}$$

If we assume again that $\phi_0$ is centred on $B$, this term vanishes and we are left with the potential

$$\varepsilon P_0 H_1 P_0 = \varepsilon^2 V^0_{\mathrm{bend}} - 2\varepsilon^3 \int_{F_x} \phi_0\, \mathrm{div}_{g_\mathrm{s}}\big(\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\mathrm{d}\phi_0, \cdot)\big)\ \mathrm{d}\nu + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^4) \tag{30}$$

with an error bound in $\mathcal{L}\big(W^2(B), L^2(B)\big)$.

### 4.4.2 The Adiabatic Potential $V_\mathrm{a}$ and "Twisted" Waveguides

Since the fibres $F_x$ are completely geodesic with respect to $g_F$ for massive quantum waveguides (cf. Remark 4.2), we have $\eta_F = 0$ and the adiabatic potential defined in (12) reduces to

$$V_\mathrm{a} = \int_{F_x} \pi_M^* g_B(\mathrm{grad}_{g_\mathrm{s}}\, \phi_0, \mathrm{grad}_{g_\mathrm{s}}\, \phi_0)\ \mathrm{d}\nu\,. \tag{31}$$

This is called the Born-Huang potential in the context of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation. This potential is always non-negative. It basically accounts for the alteration rate of $\phi_0$ in horizontal directions.

In the literature, the adiabatic potential has been studied mainly for "twisted" quantum waveguides. These have two-dimensional fibres $F_x$ which are isometric but not invariant under rotations and twist as one moves along the one-dimensional base curve $B$ [Kre07]. The operators $\Delta_{F_x}$, $x \in B$, are isospectral and their non-trivial dependence on $x$ is captured by $V_\mathrm{a}$.

We now generalise this concept to massive waveguides of arbitrary dimension and codimension and calculate the adiabatic potential for this class of examples. In this context, a massive quantum waveguide $F \to M \xrightarrow{\pi_M} B$ is said to be only twisted at $x_0 \in B$, if there exist a geodesic ball $U \subset B$ around $x_0$ and a local orthonormal frame $\{f_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^k$ of $\mathsf{N}B|_U$ such that

$$\pi_M^{-1}(U) = \big\{n^\alpha f_\alpha(x) :\ (n^1, \ldots, n^k) \in F,\ x \in U\big\}\,.$$

This exactly describes the situation that the cross-sections $(F_x, g_{F_x})$ are isometric to $F \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, but may vary from fibre to fibre by an $\mathrm{SO}(k)$-transformation. Moreover, it follows that $\lambda_0$ is constant on $U$ and the associated eigenfunction $\phi_0$ is of the form $\phi_0(\nu(x) = n^\alpha f_\alpha(x)) = \Phi_0(n^1, \ldots, n^k)$, where $\Phi_0$ is the solution of

$$-\Delta_n \Phi_0(n) = \lambda_0 \Phi_0(n)\,, \quad \Phi_0(n) = 0 \text{ on } \partial F\,.$$

As for the calculation of $V_{\rm a}$ at $x_0$, we firstly compute for $\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i} \in \Gamma(\mathsf{H}M)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_M^* g_B(\mathrm{grad}_{g_{\rm s}}\phi_0, \partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i})|_{\nu(x_0)} &= g_{\rm s}(\mathrm{grad}_{g_{\rm s}}\phi_0, \partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i})|_{\nu(x_0)} \\
&= \partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i}\phi_0\big|_{\nu(x_0)} \\
&\overset{(18)}{=} \Big[\partial_i - g_B^\perp\big(\omega^{\mathsf{N}}(\partial_{x^i})\nu, f_\beta\big)\big|_{x_0}\partial_{n^\beta}\Big]\Phi_0(n) \\
&= -n^\alpha g_B^\perp\big(\nabla^{\mathsf{N}}_{\partial_{x^i}} f_\alpha, f_\beta\big)\big|_{x_0}\frac{\partial\Phi_0(n)}{\partial n^\beta}\,. \qquad (32)
\end{aligned}$$

In order to get a better understanding of $g_B^\perp(\nabla^{\mathsf{N}}_{\partial_{x^i}} f_\alpha, f_\beta)|_{x_0}$, we introduce on $U$ a locally untwisted orthonormal frame $\{e_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^k$ of $\mathsf{N}B|_U$. It is obtained by taking the vectors $f_\alpha(x_0) \in \mathsf{N}_{x_0}B$ and parallel transporting them along radial geodesics with respect to the normal connection $\nabla^{\mathsf{N}}$. Thus, twisting is always to be understood relative to the locally parallel frame $\{e_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^k$. The induced map that transfers the reference frame $\{e_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^k$ into the twisting frame $\{f_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^k$ is denoted by $R : U \to \mathrm{SO}(k)$. It is defined by the relation $f_\alpha(x) = e_\gamma(x)R^\gamma{}_\alpha(x)$ for $x \in U$ and obeys $R(x_0) = \mathrm{id}_{k\times k}$ due to the initial data of $\{e_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^k$. Consequently, using the differential equation of the parallel transport, we have

$$\nabla^{\mathsf{N}}_{\partial_{x^i}} f_\alpha(x_0) = \nabla^{\mathsf{N}}_{\partial_{x^i}}(e_\gamma R^\gamma{}_\alpha)(x_0) = \underbrace{\big(\nabla^{\mathsf{N}}_{\partial_{x^i}} e_\gamma\big)(x_0)}_{=0}\,\delta^\gamma{}_\alpha + e_\gamma(x)\,\partial_{x^i}R^\gamma{}_\alpha(x_0)$$

and hence

$$g_B^\perp\big(\nabla^{\mathsf{N}}_{\partial_{x^i}} f_\alpha, f_\beta\big)\big|_{x_0} = g_B^\perp(e_\gamma\,\partial_{x^i}R^\gamma{}_\alpha, e_\beta)|_{x_0} = \partial_{x^i}R_{\beta\alpha}(x_0)\,. \qquad (33)$$

For $1 \le \alpha < \beta \le k$, let $T_{\alpha\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times k}$ defined by

$$(T_{\alpha\beta})_{\gamma\zeta} := \delta_{\alpha\zeta}\delta_{\beta\gamma} - \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\delta_{\beta\zeta}$$

be a set of generators of the Lie Algebra $\mathfrak{so}(k)$. This induces generalised angle functions $\{\omega^{\alpha\beta} \in C^\infty(U)\}_{\alpha<\beta}$ by the relation

$$R(x) = \exp\Big(\sum_{\alpha<\beta}\omega^{\alpha\beta}(x)T_{\alpha\beta}\Big)$$

for $x \in U$. Then a short calculation shows that

$$\partial_{x^i}R(x_0) = \big((\partial_{x^i}\omega^{\alpha\beta}T_{\alpha\beta})R\big)(x_0) = \mathrm{d}\omega^{\alpha\beta}(\partial_{x^i})|_{x_0}T_{\alpha\beta} \qquad (34)$$

for $\alpha < \beta$. Combining (32), (33) and (34), we obtain

$$\pi_M^* g_B(\mathrm{grad}_{g_{\rm s}}\phi_0, \partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i})|_{\nu(x_0)=n^\alpha f_\alpha(x_0)} = -\mathrm{d}\omega^{\alpha\beta}(\partial_{x^i})|_{x_0}(L_{\alpha\beta}\Phi_0)(n)\,, \quad \alpha<\beta\,,$$

where

$$L_{\alpha\beta} : \Phi_0(n) \mapsto (L_{\alpha\beta}\Phi_0)(n) := \langle(\nabla_n\Phi_0)(n), T_{\alpha\beta}n\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^k} = (n^\alpha\partial_{n^\beta} - n^\beta\partial_{n^\alpha})\Phi_0(n)$$

defines the action of the $(\alpha,\beta)$-component of the angular momentum operator in $k$ dimensions. From here, it is easy to see that the adiabatic potential at $x_0$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\mathrm{a}}(x_0) &= \int_{F_{x_0}} \pi_M^* g_B(\mathrm{grad}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}}\phi_0, \mathrm{grad}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}}\phi_0)\,\mathrm{d}\nu \\ &= \int_F g_B\big(-\mathrm{d}\omega^{\alpha\beta}(L_{\alpha\beta}\Phi_0)(n), -\mathrm{d}\omega^{\gamma\zeta}(L_{\gamma\zeta}\Phi_0)(n)\big)\big|_{x_0}\,\mathrm{d}n \\ &= \underbrace{g_B(\mathrm{d}\omega^{\alpha\beta},\mathrm{d}\omega^{\gamma\zeta})|_{x_0}}_{=:\mathbf{R}^{(\alpha\beta),(\gamma\zeta)}(x_0)} \underbrace{\langle L_{\alpha\beta}\Phi_0, L_{\gamma\zeta}\Phi_0\rangle_{L^2(F)}}_{=:\mathbf{L}_{(\alpha\beta),(\gamma\zeta)}}, \quad \alpha<\beta \text{ and } \gamma<\zeta \qquad (35) \\ &= \mathrm{tr}_{\mathbb{R}^{k(k-1)/2}}\big(\mathbf{R}(x_0)^{\mathrm{t}}\mathbf{L}\big)\,. \end{aligned}$$

The first matrix $\mathbf{R}(x_0)$ encodes the rate, at which the frame $\{f_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^k$ twists relatively to the parallel frame $\{e_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^k$ at $x_0$. The second matrix $\mathbf{L}$ measures the deviation of the eigenfunction $\Phi_0$ from being rotationally invariant. It determines to which extent the twisting of the waveguide effects the states in the range of $P_0$ and it depends only on the set $F\subset\mathbb{R}^k$ (and not on the point $x_0$ of the submanifold $B$). Finally for the case of a twisted quantum waveguides with $(B,g_B)\cong(\mathbb{R},\delta^1)$ and $k=2$, there exists only one angle function $\omega\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and one angular momentum operator $L=n^1\partial_{n^2}-n^2\partial_{n^1}$. Then formula (35) yields the well-known result [KS12]

$$V_{\mathrm{a}} = (\omega')^2\,\|L\Phi_0\|^2_{L^2(F)}\,,$$

which clearly vanishes if $F$ is invariant under rotations.

### 4.4.3 Conclusion

Now that we have calculated all the relevant quantities, we can give an explicit expansion of $H_{\mathrm{a}}$. The correct norm for error bounds of course depends on the energy scale under consideration. For a constant eigenvalue $\lambda_0$ and $\alpha=2$ the graph-norm of $\varepsilon^{-2}H_{\mathrm{a}}$ is clearly equivalent (with constants independent of $\varepsilon$) to the usual norm of $W^2(B,g_B)$. In this situation the best approximation by $H_{\mathrm{a}}$ given by Theorem 3.3 has errors of order $\varepsilon^4$, so the estimates just derived give

$$H_{\mathrm{a}} = -\varepsilon^2\Delta_{g_B}+\lambda_0+\varepsilon^2V_{\mathrm{a}}+\varepsilon^2V^0_{\mathrm{bend}}-2\varepsilon^3\int_{F_x}\phi_0\,\mathrm{div}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}}\big(\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\mathrm{d}\phi_0,\cdot)\big)\,\mathrm{d}\nu+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^4)\ \ (\alpha=2)$$

if $\phi_0$ is centred. If this is not the case, the expansion can be read off from equations (24), (27) and (31).

If $\lambda_0$ has a non-degenerate minimum and $\alpha=1$, the errors of our best approximation are of order $\varepsilon^3$. Thus, the potentials of order $\varepsilon^3$ can be disregarded in this case. Note however that on the domain of $\varepsilon^{-1}H_{\mathrm{a}}$ we have $\varepsilon\partial^{\mathsf{H}M}_{x^i}=\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$, so the differential operator (29) will be relevant. The error terms of equation (30), containing second order differential operators, are of order $\varepsilon^3$ with respect to $\varepsilon^{-1}H_{\mathrm{a}}$, so they are still negligible. Thus, for $\psi\in W^2(B)$ with $\|\psi\|^2+\|(-\varepsilon\Delta_{g_B}+\varepsilon^{-1}\lambda_0)\psi\|^2=\mathcal{O}(1)$ we have

$$H_{\mathrm{a}}\psi = \big(-\varepsilon^2\Delta_{g_B}+\lambda_0+\varepsilon^2V_{\mathrm{a}}+\varepsilon^2V^0_{\mathrm{bend}}\big)\psi-2\varepsilon^3\,\mathrm{div}_{g_B}\int_{F_x}|\phi_0(\nu)|^2\,\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\mathrm{d}\psi,\cdot)\,\mathrm{d}\nu+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3)\,,$$

where the last term is of order $\varepsilon^2$ in general and vanishes for centred $\phi_0$.

# 5 Hollow Quantum Waveguides

In this section we consider hollow quantum waveguides $F \to (M, g^\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{\pi_M} (B, g_B)$, which by Definition 2.2 are the boundaries of massive waveguides. This underlying massive wavguide is denoted by $\mathring{F} \to (\mathring{M}, \mathring{g}^\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{\pi_{\mathring{M}}} (B, g_B)$ in the following. The bundle structure is inherited from the massive waveguide as well, i.e. $F = \partial \mathring{F}$ and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \hookrightarrow & \mathring{M} \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_M}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_{\mathring{M}}} \\ B & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{id}_B]{} & B \end{array}$$

commutes.

Hollow quantum waveguides have, to our knowledge, not been studied before. In fact, already the derivations of $g^\varepsilon$ and $V_{\mathrm{bend}}$ constitute novel results. A slight generalisation of these calculations to objects that are not necessarily boundaries can be found in [Lam13, Chapter 3].

In order to determine the adiabatic operator $H_{\mathrm{a}}$ for hollow quantum waveguides, we follow the same procedure as layed out in the introduction and in the previous section.

## 5.1 The Pullback Metric

Note that $g^\varepsilon = \mathring{g}^\varepsilon|_{\mathsf{T}M}$ and that we computed the unscaled pullback metric $\mathring{g}^{\varepsilon=1}$ for the massive waveguide $\mathring{M}$ already in Lemma 4.1. The latter reads

$$\mathring{g} := \mathring{g}^{\varepsilon=1} = \underbrace{\pi_{\mathring{M}}^* g_B + \mathring{h}^{\varepsilon=1}}_{=:\mathring{g}^{\mathrm{hor}}} + g_{\mathring{F}}\,,$$

where the "horizontal correction" $\mathring{h}^{\varepsilon=1}$ (20) vanishes on vertical vector fields and essentially depends on the extrinsic geometry of the embedding $B \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d+k}$.

If we restrict $\mathring{M}$'s tangent bundle to $M$, one has the orthogonal decomposition

$$\mathsf{T}\mathring{M}|_M = \mathsf{T}M \oplus \mathsf{N}M \overset{(6)}{=} \mathsf{H}M \oplus \mathsf{V}M \oplus \mathsf{N}M \tag{36}$$

with respect to $\mathring{g}$. Due to the commutativity of the above diagram, it follows that $\mathsf{V}M \subset \mathsf{V}\mathring{M}|_M$. This suggests to introduce the notation $\mathsf{V}M^\perp$ for the orthogonal complement of $\mathsf{V}M$ in $\mathsf{V}\mathring{M}|_M$ with respect to $g_{\mathring{F}}$, i.e.

$$\mathsf{V}\mathring{M}|_M = \mathsf{V}M \oplus \mathsf{V}M^\perp\,. \tag{37}$$

For any $X \in \Gamma(\mathsf{T}B)$, let $X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}} \in \Gamma(\mathsf{H}\mathring{M})$ and $X^{\mathsf{H}M} \in \Gamma(\mathsf{H}M)$ be the respective unique horizontal lifts. It then holds that

$$\pi_{\mathring{M}*}\big(X^{\mathsf{H}M} - X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M\big) = \pi_{M*}X^{\mathsf{H}M} - \pi_{\mathring{M}*}X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M = X - X = 0\,.$$

Thus, the difference between $X^{\mathsf{H}M}$ and $X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M$ is a vertical field:

$$X^{\mathsf{H}M} = X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M + V_X \tag{38}$$

with $V_X \in \Gamma(\mathsf{V}\mathring{M}|_M)$. Moreover, $V_X \in \Gamma(\mathsf{V}M^\perp)$ since for arbitrary $W \in \Gamma(\mathsf{V}M) \subset \Gamma(\mathsf{V}\mathring{M}|_M)$

$$0 = g(X^{\mathsf{H}M}, W) = \underbrace{\mathring{g}\big(X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M, W\big)}_{=0} + g_{\mathring{F}}\big(V_X, W\big)$$

implies $g_{\mathring{F}}(V_X, W) = 0$.




Figure 1: Left: Sketch of the fibre $\mathsf{N}_xB$ for any $x \in B$. Note that for any $\nu \in \mathring{M}_x \subset \mathsf{N}_xB$ we have the canonical identification of $\mathsf{N}_xB$ and $\mathsf{V}_\nu\mathring{M}$ via the isomorphism (17). Right: Relationship between the horizontal lifts $X^{\mathsf{H}M}$ and $X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M$. They are connected by the vertical field $V_X$.

Obviously, the relation $\pi_{M*}X^{\mathsf{H}M} = X$ does not shed light on the vertical part $V_X$. The latter will be determined by the requirement $X^{\mathsf{H}M}$ to be a tangent vector field on $M$, or equivalently by the condition $\mathring{g}(X^{\mathsf{H}M}, n) = 0$, where $n \in \Gamma(\mathsf{N}M)$ denotes a unit normal field of $M$ in $\mathring{M}$. In order to determine $V_X$ from this condition, we first need to show that the vertical component of $n$ is non-zero everywhere.

**Lemma 5.1** *Let $n \in \Gamma(\mathsf{N}M)$ be a unit normal field of the hollow quantum waveguide $M$. Then $v_n := \mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{V}\mathring{M}}\, n \in \Gamma(\mathsf{V}M^\perp)$ is a non-vanishing vector field.*

*Proof.* Decompose $n = v_n + h_n$ with $h_n := \mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}} n \in \Gamma(\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}|_M)$. It then holds for any vector field $W \in \Gamma(\mathsf{V}M)$:

$$g_{\mathring{F}}(W, v_n) = \mathring{g}(W, v_n) = \mathring{g}(W, v_n + h_n) = \mathring{g}(W, n) = 0\,,$$

where we used (36) for the second and fourth equality. This clearly implies $v_n \in \Gamma(\mathsf{V}M^\perp)$ by (37). Now suppose there exists $\nu \in M$ with $v_n(\nu) = 0$. Consider the space

$$U_\nu := \mathsf{H}_\nu M \oplus \mathrm{span}\{(n(\nu)\} \subset \mathsf{T}_\nu \mathring{M}\,.$$

Since $n(\nu) \in \mathsf{N}_\nu M$ is orthogonal to $\mathsf{H}_\nu M \subset \mathsf{T}_\nu M$, one has $\dim(U_\nu) = d + 1$. We will show that the kernel of $\pi_{\mathring{M}*}|_{U_\nu} : U_\nu \to \mathrm{im}(\pi_{\mathring{M}*}|_{U_\nu}) \subset \mathsf{T}_{\pi_{\mathring{M}}(\nu)}B$ is trivial. Hence,

$$d + 1 = \dim(U_\nu) = \mathrm{rank}(\pi_{\mathring{M}*}|_{U_\nu}) \leq \dim\big(\mathsf{T}_{\pi_{\mathring{M}}(\nu)}B\big)$$

clearly contradicts the fact that $\dim(B) = d$ and finally the assumption that $n(\nu) = 0$. Therefor, let $w \in \ker(\pi_{\mathring{M}*}|_{U_\nu}) \in \mathsf{V}_\nu \mathring{M} \cap U_\nu$. On the one hand, since

$$n(\nu) = \underbrace{v_n(\nu)}_{=0} + h_n(\nu) \in \mathsf{H}_\nu \mathring{M} = \ker(\pi_{\mathring{M}*}|_\nu)^\perp\,,$$

$w$ is an element of $\mathsf{H}_\nu M$. But on the other hand, $\pi_{\mathring{M}*}|_{\mathsf{H}_\nu M} : \mathsf{H}_\nu M \to \mathsf{T}_{\pi_{\mathring{M}}(\nu)}B$ posseses a trivial kernel. Together, this yields $w = 0$, i.e. $\ker(\pi_{\mathring{M}*}|_{U_\nu}) = \{0\}$. □

In view of equation (38), Lemma 5.1 suggests to define a function $\beth(X) \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $V_X = \beth(X) v_n$. Thus, the requirement $X^{\mathsf{H}M} \in \Gamma(\mathsf{T}M)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathring{g}(X^{\mathsf{H}M}, n) = \mathring{g}\big(X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M, n\big) + \mathring{g}(v_n, n)\beth(X) \\ &= \mathring{g}^{\mathrm{hor}}\big(X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M, h_n\big) + g_{\mathring{F}}(v_n, v_n)\beth(X)\,, \end{aligned}$$

consequently

$$\beth(X) = -\frac{\mathring{g}^{\mathrm{hor}}(X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M, h_n)}{g_{\mathring{F}}(v_n, v_n)}\,. \tag{39}$$

Note that $\beth(X)$ is well-defined since $g_{\mathring{F}}(v_n, v_n) > 0$ by Lemma 5.1. Moreover, the latter equation shows that $\beth \in \mathcal{T}^0_1(B) \otimes C^\infty(M)$ is actually a tensor.

In summary, we just showed that the unscaled pullback metric on $M$ may be written as

$$g = g^{\mathrm{hor}} + g_F\,, \quad g_F := g_{\mathring{F}}|_{\mathsf{V}M}$$

with "horizontal block"

$$g^{\mathrm{hor}}(X^{\mathsf{H}M}, Y^{\mathsf{H}M}) := \mathring{g}^{\mathrm{hor}}\big(X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M, Y^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M\big) + g_{\mathring{F}}(v_n, v_n)\beth(X)\beth(Y)$$

for $X, Y \in \Gamma(\mathsf{T}B)$. Going over to the scaled pullback metric $g^\varepsilon$, we first show that the horizontal lift remains unchanged.

**Lemma 5.2** *Let $(M, g^\varepsilon) \to (B, g_B)$ be a hollow quantum waveguide for $\varepsilon > 0$. Then the horizontal subbundle $\mathsf{H}M$ is independent of $\varepsilon$.*

*Proof.* It is sufficient to show that for any vector field $X \in \Gamma(\mathsf{T}B)$ its unique horizontal lift $X^{\mathsf{H}M}$ is given by the $\varepsilon$-independent expression

$$X^{\mathsf{H}M} = X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M + \beth(X) v_n$$

with $\beth(X) \in C^\infty(M)$ and $v_n \in \Gamma(\mathsf{V}M^\perp)$ as before. We already know that $X^{\mathsf{H}M}$ is tangent to $M$ and satisfies $\pi_{M*} X^{\mathsf{H}M} = X$. Thus, the requirement that $X^{\mathsf{H}M}$ is orthogonal to any $W \in \Gamma(\mathsf{V}M)$ with respect $g^\varepsilon$ is the only possible way for any $\varepsilon$-dependence to come into play. Therefore, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} g^\varepsilon(X^{\mathsf{H}M}, W) &= \mathring{g}^\varepsilon\big(X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M + \beth(X) v_n, W\big) \\ &= \underbrace{\varepsilon^{-2}\Big[\pi_{\mathring{M}}^* g_B\big(X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M, W\big) + \varepsilon \mathring{h}^\varepsilon\big(X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M, W\big)\Big]}_{=\,0,\ \text{since } W \in \Gamma(\mathsf{V}M) \subset \Gamma(\mathsf{V}\mathring{M}|_M)} + \beth(X) \underbrace{g_{\mathring{F}}(v_n, W)}_{=\,0 \text{ by (37)}} \\ &= 0\,. \end{aligned}$$

□

In summary, if the scaled pullback metric of the massive waveguide $\mathring{M}$ has the form $\mathring{g}^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-2}(\pi_{\mathring{M}}^* g_B + \varepsilon \mathring{h}^\varepsilon) + g_{\mathring{F}}$, the scaled pullback metric $g^\varepsilon$ of the associated hollow waveguide $M$ reads

$$g^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-2}(\pi_M^* g_B + \varepsilon h^\varepsilon) + g_F \tag{40}$$

with

$$h^\varepsilon(X^{\mathsf{H}M}, Y^{\mathsf{H}M}) := \mathring{h}^\varepsilon\big(X^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M, Y^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M\big) + \varepsilon g_{\mathring{F}}(v_n, v_n) \beth(X) \beth(Y)$$

for $X, Y \in \Gamma(\mathsf{T}B)$. This shows that the scaled pullback metric $g^\varepsilon$ is again of the form (7).

**Example 5.3** Let us consider a simple example of a hollow quantum waveguide with $d = 1$, $k = 2$. Take $B = \{(x, 0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^3 :\ x \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ as submanifold and parametrise the according massive quantum waveguide via

$$\mathring{M} := \Big\{(x, 0, 0) + \varrho\, r(x, \varphi) e_r :\ (x, \varphi, \varrho) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, 2\pi) \times [0, 1]\Big\},$$

where $r : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 2\pi) \to [r_-, r_+]$ with $0 < r_- < r_+ < \infty$ is a smooth function obeying the periodicity condition $r(\cdot, \varphi + 2\pi) = r(\cdot, \varphi)$ and $e_r = (0, \cos\varphi, \sin\varphi) \in \mathsf{V}_{(x,\varphi,\varrho)}\mathring{M}$ stands for the "radial unit vector". In view of Example 2.3 with $\kappa \equiv 0$, the unscaled pullback metric on $\mathring{M}$ is given by

$$\mathring{g} = \mathring{g}^{\mathrm{hor}} + g_{\mathring{F}} = \mathrm{d}x^2 + (\varrho^2\, \mathrm{d}\varphi^2 + \mathrm{d}\varrho^2)\,.$$

Furthermore, we immediately observe that $\mathsf{T}_x B = \operatorname{span}\{\partial_x\}$ with trivial horizontal lift $\partial_x^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}} = (1,0,0) =: e_x \in \mathsf{H}_{(x,\varphi,\varrho)}\mathring{M}$. The hollow quantum waveguide associated to $M$ is obviously given by

$$M := \Big\{(x,0,0) + r(x,\varphi)e_r : \ (x,\varphi) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0,2\pi)\Big\} = \mathring{M}|_{\varrho=1}\,.$$

Consequently, $\mathsf{T}_{(x,\varphi)}M$ is given by $\operatorname{span}\{\tau_x, \tau_\varphi\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_x(x,\varphi) &= \tfrac{\partial M}{\partial x}(x,\varphi) = e_x + \tfrac{\partial r}{\partial x}e_r\,,\\ \tau_\varphi(x,\varphi) &= \tfrac{\partial M}{\partial \varphi}(x,\varphi) = \tfrac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi}e_r + re_\varphi\end{aligned}$$

with $e_\varphi = (0, -\sin\varphi, \cos\varphi) \in \mathsf{V}_{(x,\varphi,\varrho)}\mathring{M}$. One easily agrees that $\tau_x$ and $\tau_\varphi$ are orthogonal to

$$\tilde{n} = -\tfrac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi}e_\varphi + re_r - r\tfrac{\partial r}{\partial x}e_x$$

with respect to $\mathring{g}$. Hence,

$$n(x,\varphi) := \frac{\tilde{n}}{\|\tilde{n}\|_{\mathring{g}}} = \underbrace{\frac{-\frac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi}e_\varphi + re_r}{\sqrt{(\frac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi})^2 + r^2\left[1 + (\frac{\partial r}{\partial x})^2\right]}}}_{=:v_n \in \mathsf{V}_{(x,\varphi)}M^\perp} + \underbrace{\frac{-r\frac{\partial r}{\partial x}e_x}{\sqrt{(\frac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi})^2 + r^2\left[1 + (\frac{\partial r}{\partial x})^2\right]}}}_{=:h_n \in \mathsf{H}_{(x,\varphi)}\mathring{M}}$$

is a unit normal vector of $M$ at $(x,\varphi)$ for $\varepsilon = 1$. Noting that

$$g_{\mathring{F}}(v_n, v_n) = \frac{(\frac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi})^2 + r^2}{(\frac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi})^2 + r^2\left[1 + (\frac{\partial r}{\partial x})^2\right]}\,,$$

equation (39) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\beth(\partial_x) &= -\frac{\mathring{g}^{\mathrm{hor}}(\partial_x^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M, h_n)}{g_{\mathring{F}}(v_n, v_n)}\\ &= -\frac{-r\frac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi}}{\sqrt{(\frac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi})^2 + r^2\left[1 + (\frac{\partial r}{\partial x})^2\right]}}\left(\frac{(\frac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi})^2 + r^2}{(\frac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi})^2 + r^2\left[1 + (\frac{\partial r}{\partial x})^2\right]}\right)^{-1}\\ &= \frac{r\frac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi}\sqrt{(\frac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi})^2 + r^2\left[1 + (\frac{\partial r}{\partial x})^2\right]}}{(\frac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi})^2 + r^2}\,.\end{aligned}$$

This yields the following expression for the "horizontal block" of the scaled pullback metric $g^\varepsilon$:

$$\begin{aligned}g^{\varepsilon,\mathrm{hor}}(\partial_x^{\mathsf{H}M}, \partial_x^{\mathsf{H}M}) &= \varepsilon^{-2}\,\mathrm{d}x^2\big(\partial_x^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M, \partial_x^{\mathsf{H}\mathring{M}}|_M\big) + g_{\mathring{F}}(v_n, v_n)\beth(\partial_x)\beth(\partial_x)\\ &= \varepsilon^{-2} + \frac{r^2(\frac{\partial r}{\partial x})^2}{(\frac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi})^2 + r^2}\\ &= \varepsilon^{-2}\big(1 + \varepsilon h^\varepsilon(\partial_x^{\mathsf{H}M}, \partial_x^{\mathsf{H}M})\big)\end{aligned}$$

with

$$h^{\varepsilon}(\partial_x^{\mathsf{H}M}, \partial_x^{\mathsf{H}M}) = \varepsilon \frac{r^2(\frac{\partial r}{\partial x})^2}{(\frac{\partial r}{\partial \varphi})^2 + r^2}\,.$$

## 5.2 The Adiabatic Hamiltonian

We now calculate the adiabatic operator for hollow waveguides. Since in this case the fibre is a manifold without boundary, the ground state of $H_F$ is explicitly known:

$$\phi_0 = \sqrt{\frac{\rho_\varepsilon}{\|\rho_\varepsilon\|_1}} = \pi_M^* \mathrm{Vol}(F_x)^{-1/2} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)\,,$$

where $\|\rho_\varepsilon\|_1(x)$ is the $L^1$-norm of $\rho_\varepsilon$ on the fibre $F_x$. Because of this we can express many of the terms appearing in $H_{\mathrm{a}}$, given in equation (13), through $\rho_\varepsilon$.

Let us begin with the sum of the modified bending potential $\tilde{V}_{\mathrm{bend}}$ appearing in $H_1$ and the adiabatic potential $V_{\mathrm{a}}$. First we obtain an expression for the one-form $\bar{\eta}$ by observing that for any vector field $X$ on $B$

$$0 = X \int_{F_x} |\phi_0|^2 \,\mathrm{d}g_F = \int_{F_x} X^{\mathsf{H}M} |\phi_0|^2 \,\mathrm{d}g_F - \underbrace{\int_{F_x} |\phi_0|^2 \, g_B(X, \pi_{M*}\eta_F) \,\mathrm{d}g_F}_{=\bar{\eta}(X)}\,.$$

So we see that

$$\bar{\eta} = \int_{F_x} \mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{H}M}\big(\mathrm{d}|\phi_0|^2\big) \,\mathrm{d}g_F\,. \tag{41}$$

Now to start with the first term of the adiabatic potential can be calculated as in (29)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{tr}_{g_B}(\nabla^B \bar{\eta}) &= \mathrm{div}_{g_B} g_B(\bar{\eta}, \cdot) \\
&\overset{(22)}{=} \int_{F_x} \mathrm{div}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}}\big(\mathrm{P}^{\mathsf{H}M} \,\mathrm{grad}_{g_{\mathrm{s}}} |\phi_0|^2\big) \,\mathrm{d}g_F \\
&\overset{(9)}{=} \int_{F_x} \Delta_{\mathsf{H}} |\phi_0|^2 \,\mathrm{d}g_F\,.
\end{aligned}$$

For the the modified bending potential one has, using the shorthand $|F_x| = \mathrm{Vol}(F_x)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon^2 \tilde{V}^{\mathrm{a}}_{\mathrm{bend}} &:= P_0\big(V_{\mathrm{bend}} - \tfrac{1}{2}\Delta_{\mathsf{V}}(\log \rho_\varepsilon) - \tfrac{1}{4} g_F(\mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon, \mathrm{d}\log\rho_\varepsilon)\big) P_0 \\
&= \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \int_{F_x} |\phi_0|^2 \,\Delta_{\mathsf{H}}(\log\rho_\varepsilon) \,\mathrm{d}g_F + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^4) \\
&= \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \int_{F_x} |F_x|^{-1} (\Delta_{\mathsf{H}}\rho_\varepsilon) \,\mathrm{d}g_F + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^4)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that this expression is of order $\varepsilon^3$ since $\rho_\varepsilon = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. Hence, bending does not contribute to the leading order of $H_\mathrm{a}$. Now inserting the explicit form of $\phi_0$ an elementary calculation yields

$$V_\mathrm{a} + \tilde{V}^\mathrm{a}_\mathrm{bend} = \int_{F_x} -\tfrac{1}{2}\rho_\varepsilon \Delta_\mathsf{H} \|\rho_\varepsilon\|_1^{-1} - \tfrac{1}{2} g_B\big(\operatorname{grad}|F_x|^{-1}, \pi_{M*}\operatorname{grad}\rho_\varepsilon\big) + \tfrac{1}{4}\rho_\varepsilon \|\rho_\varepsilon\|_1 \, g_B\big(\pi_{M*}\operatorname{grad}\|\rho_\varepsilon\|_1^{-1}, \pi_{M*}\operatorname{grad}\|\rho_\varepsilon\|_1^{-1}\big)\, \mathrm{d}g_F + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\,. \tag{42}$$

With $\rho_\varepsilon = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ and $\|\rho_\varepsilon\|_1 = |F_x| + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ one easily checks that up to order $\varepsilon$ this expression equals

$$\tfrac{1}{4} g_B\big(\mathrm{d}\log|F_x|, \mathrm{d}\log|F_x|\big) + \tfrac{1}{2}\Delta_{g_B}\log|F_x|\,.$$

As far as the remaining terms of $H_1$ are concerned, note that the scaled pullback metric $g^\varepsilon$ of the hollow waveguide has the same expansion on horizontal one-forms up to errors of order $\varepsilon^4$ as in the case of the massive waveguide (26), i.e.

$$g^\varepsilon(\pi_M^*\mathrm{d}x^i, \pi_M^*\mathrm{d}x^j) = \varepsilon^2\big(g_B^{ij} + 2\varepsilon\,\mathrm{II}(\nu)^{ij} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)\big)\,.$$

Hence, we can calculate these terms starting from expression (28). Since the latter all carry a prefactor $\varepsilon^3$, we may replace any $\phi_0$ by $|F_x|^{-1/2}$, obtaining for $\psi \in L^2(B)$

$$\int_{F_x} \operatorname{div}_{g_\mathrm{s}}\big(|\phi_0|^2\,\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\mathrm{d}\psi,\cdot)\big)\,\mathrm{d}g_F = \int_{F_x}\operatorname{div}_{g_\mathrm{s}}\big(|F_x|^{-1}\,\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\mathrm{d}\psi,\cdot)\big)\,\mathrm{d}g_F + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \tag{43}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{F_x}\phi_0\operatorname{div}_{g_\mathrm{s}}\big(\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\pi_{M*}\operatorname{grad}_{g_\mathrm{s}}\phi_0,\cdot)\big)\,\mathrm{d}g_F\\ &= \int_{F_x}|F_x|^{-1/2}\operatorname{div}_{g_\mathrm{s}}\big(\mathrm{II}(\nu)\big(\mathrm{d}\,|F_x|^{-1/2},\cdot\big)\big)\,\mathrm{d}g_F + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

As in equation (29) we have

$$\int_{F_x}\operatorname{div}_{g_\mathrm{s}}\big(|F_x|^{-1}\,\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\mathrm{d}\psi,\cdot)\big)\,\mathrm{d}g_F = \operatorname{div}_{g_B}\int_{F_x}|F_x|^{-1}\,\mathrm{II}(\nu)(\mathrm{d}\psi,\cdot)\,\mathrm{d}g_F\,.$$

Again, this term vanishes if the barycentre of the fibres $F_x = \partial\mathring{F}_x \subset \mathsf{N}_x B$ is zero, that is

$$\int_{F_x}\nu\,\mathrm{d}g_F = 0\,.$$

Since $\lambda_0 \equiv 0$, the adiabatic operator is of the form

$$\begin{aligned}H_\mathrm{a} &= -\varepsilon^2\Delta_{g_B} + \varepsilon^2 V_\mathrm{a} + \varepsilon P_0 H_1 P_0\\ &= -\varepsilon^2\Delta_{g_B} + \varepsilon^2\Big(\tfrac{1}{4}g_B\big(\mathrm{d}\log|F_x|,\mathrm{d}\log|F_x|\big) + \tfrac{1}{2}\Delta_{g_B}\log|F_x|\Big) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3)\,,\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

with an error in $\mathcal{L}(W^2(B), L^2(B))$. Thus, the adiabatic operator at leading order is just the Laplacian on the base $B$ plus an effective potential depending solely on the relative change of the volume of the fibres. Going one order further in the approximation, we have

$$\varepsilon^2 V_\mathrm{a} + \varepsilon P_0 H_1 P_0 = \varepsilon^2 (42) + 2\varepsilon^3 (44) + 2\varepsilon^3 (43) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^4)$$

in the same norm. Hence, $H_\mathrm{a}$ also contains the second order differential operator (43) if the barycentre of $F_x$ is different from zero. Let us also remark that the leading order of the adiabatic potential can also be calculated by applying a unitary transformation $L^2(F, \mathrm{d}g_F) \to L^2(F, |F_x|^{-1}\,\mathrm{d}g_F)$ that rescales fibre volume to one, in the spirit of $\mathcal{M}_\rho$ (cf. equation (10)). In this way a similar potential was derived by Kleine [Kle88], in a slightly different context, for a special case with one-dimensional base and without bending.

# References


[BMT07] G. Bouchitté, M. L. Mascarenhas and L. Trabucho, *On the curvature and torsion effects in one dimensional waveguides*, ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations **13** (2007), no. 4, pp. 793–808.

[Bis75] R. L. Bishop, *There is more than one way to frame a curve*, The American Mathematical Monthly **82** (1975), no. 3, pp. 246–251.

[CEK04] G. Carron, P. Exner and D. Krejčiřík, *Topologically nontrivial quantum layers*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **45** (2004), no. 2, pp. 774–784.

[daC82] R. Da Costa, *Constraints in quantum mechanics*, Physical Review A **25** (1982), no. 6, pp. 2893–2900.

[DE95] P. Duclos and P. Exner, *Curvature-induced bound states in quantum waveguides in two and three dimensions*, Reviews in Mathematical Physics **7** (1995), no. 1, pp. 73–102.

[FH01] R. Froese and I. Herbst, *Realizing holonomic constraints in classical and quantum mechanics*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **220** (2001), no. 3, pp. 489–535.

[JK71] H. Jensen and H. Koppe, *Quantum mechanics with constraints*, Annals of Physics **63** (1971), no. 2, pp. 586–591.

[Jos05] J. Jost, *Riemannian geometry and geometric analysis*, Universitext, Springer (2005).

[Kle88] R. Kleine, *Discreteness conditions for the Laplacian on complete, noncompact Riemannian manifolds*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **198** (1988), no. 1, pp. 127-141.

[Kre07] D. Krejčiřík, *Twisting versus bending in quantum waveguides*, Proceedings of the Symposium on Pure Mathematics **77**, pp. 617-636, American Mathematical Society (2008).

[KL12] D. Krejčiřík and Z. Lu, *Location of the essential spectrum in curved quantum layers*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1211.2541 (2012).

[KR13] D. Krejčiřík and N. Raymond, *Magnetic effects in curved quantum waveguides*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1303.6844 (2013).

[KRT13] D. Krejčiřík, N. Raymond and M. Tušek, *The magnetic Laplacian in shrinking tubular neighbourhoods of hypersurfaces.* arXiv preprint arXiv:1303.4753 (2013).

[KS12] D. Krejčiřík and H. Šediváková, *The effective Hamiltonian in curved quantum waveguides under mild regularity assumptions*, Reviews in Mathematical Physics **24** (2012), no. 7, 1250018 (39 pages).

[Lam13] J. Lampart, *The adiabatic limit of Schrödinger operators on fibre bundles*, PhD thesis (2013), Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen.

[LT14] J. Lampart and S. Teufel, *The adiabatic limit of Schrödinger operators on fibre bundles*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1402.0382 (2014).

[LL06] C. Lin and Z. Lu, *On the discrete spectrum of generalized quantum tubes*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations **31** (2006), no. 10, pp. 1529–1546.

[Mar95] P. Maraner, *A complete perturbative expansion for quantum mechanics with constraints*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General **28** (1995), no. 10, pp. 2939–2951.

[Mit01] K. A. Mitchell, *Gauge fields and extrapotentials in constrained quantum systems*, Physical review A **63** (2001), no. 4, 042112 (20 pages).

[deO13] G. de Oliveira, *Quantum dynamics of a particle constrained to lie on a surface*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1310.6651 (2013).

[dOV11] C. R. de Oliveira and A. A. Verri, *On the spectrum and weakly effective operator for Dirichlet Laplacian in thin deformed tubes*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications **381** (2011), no. 1, pp. 454–468.

[SS13] J. Stockhofe and P. Schmelcher, *Curved quantum waveguides: Nonadiabatic couplings and gauge theoretical structure*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.6925 (2013).

[Teu03] S. Teufel, *Adiabatic pertubation theory in quantum dynamics*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1821, Springer (2003).

[Tol88] J. Tolar, *On a quantum mechanical d'Alembert principle*, Lecture Notes in Physics 313, Springer (1988).

[WT13] S. Teufel and J. Wachsmuth, *Effective Hamiltonians for constrained quantum systems*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society **230** (2013), no. 1083 (93 pages).

[Wit07] O. Wittich, *A homogenization result for Laplacians on tubular neighbourhoods of closed Riemannian submanifolds*, Habilitation Treatise (2007), Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen.